2626 .L5 1915
amon, W. J. 4n 040101 000
dies in Acts : or the New T
0 1177 0020146 4
Carl A. Rudisill Library
38934
.L5
1915

WITHDRAWN
L. R. COLLEGE LIBRARY

Date Due

Jan 3 '62			
Feb 13 62			
Feb 27 62			
Mar 30 '67			
May 14 '68			
Nov 20 69			
Dec 2 69			
May 19 '71			
JUL 6 1984			

STUDIES IN ACTS

OR

THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOK OF BEGINNINGS

By W. J. LHAMON, A.B., A.M.
Dean of Bible School, Drury College

WITH AN

INTRODUCTION BY A. McLEAN
President of the Foreign Christian Missionary Society

ST. LOUIS
CHRISTIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION
1915

CARL A. RUDISILL LIBRARY
LENOIR RHYNE COLLEGE

BS
2626
.L5
1915

Copyrighted, 1897, by
CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

38934
Feb 1960

Affectionately Inscribed

To My Father and Mother

CONTENTS.

Introduction 7

Preliminary Essay 11

I. The First Sermon after the Ascension . . . 29

II. The First Church 51

III. The First Persecutions 71

IV. The First Martyr 89

V. The First Gentile Convert 105

VI. The First Gentile-Christian Church . . . 123

VII. The First Martyr Apostle 143

VIII. The First Foreign Missionaries 159

IX. The First Foreign Missionary Journey . . . 177

X. The First Church Council 199

XI. The First Missionary Journey in Europe . . 215

XII. Paul's First Imprisonment in Rome . . . 237

XIII. The First History of the Holy Spirit in the Church 259

XIV. Excursus. The Apostle Paul as Organizer and Unifier 275

INTRODUCTION.

AT Oriental feasts there is an officer who tastes the food and drink before they are served and certifies to their wholesomeness and palatableness. My duty is similar to that of the official taster. I have tasted the following pages and have found them "the joy and rejoicing of my heart." I am persuaded that no one can read them with care and moral earnestness without profit.

The Lord endowed the writer of these essays with a large soul. He gave him insight and independence. Mr. Lhamon is a man of scholarly tastes and scholarly attainments. His experience in the pulpit has taught him to present the profoundest truths in such a way that the common people can grasp and remember them. He has given years of patient and reverent study to the Book of Acts. He has read what the best commentators have written. In these essays he gives results and omits processes. A glance at the Table of Contents will show that he has seized on points of capital importance. He gives his readers the cream of what he has learned.

Bacon, writing of books, said, "Some are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested." One will not read many pages of this book before he will know to which class it belongs. Though written by a scholar it can be read by all. I have not found a dull or obscure sentence in it from first to last. I may not agree with the author in every detail; that is a merit rather than

a defect. It would be a poor compliment to the writer if I did. These eloquent and luminous pages have helped me mightily and have provoked me to study the Book of Acts with renewed interest. I believe they will affect others in the same way.

This book appears at the nick of time. The Sunday-schools are going to devote most of the coming year to the Acts of the Apostles. Teachers and scholars need the best helps in the market. They need the commentaries that they may study the text word by word. They will need these essays in addition to the commentaries. The plan of the work afforded the author freedom for enlarging upon points of historic and doctrinal moment, for an enlarged treatment of the character and influence of the Apostle Paul, and for such a unique and consecutive treatment of subjects as is found in the last two essays. In these Mr. Lhamon sets forth, in a systematic way, the historic work of the Holy Spirit in the Apostolic times, and the three principles which guided Paul in the organization of churches. They are: The historic or conservative principle; liberty under the direction of the Holy Spirit; and expediency in many matters. The one supreme thing is love. The discussion of these principles is particularly vigorous and suggestive. In my opinion, the reader will find this study of the Book of Acts both fresh and helpful.

A. McLEAN.

Cincinnati.

STUDIES IN ACTS

PRELIMINARY ESSAY.

THE Book of Acts is unique. It is the key-book of the New Testament. It is "The Gospel of the Holy Spirit." It is a history, a biography, a missionary manual, and an apology. As a history of the first church it is indispensable; as a character sketch of the greatest apostle it is priceless; as the manual of his missionary achievements it is of thrilling interest; as an apology it pleads the innocence of Paul when on trial in the courts of the Roman Empire.

In this book we are brought to the fulfillment of ancient prophecy and the beginning of modern history. In it we pass from the ethnic to the universal in religion, and from era to era in the providence of God. It is from first to last the story of a majestic battlefield with Jerusalem and Antioch and Ephesus and Corinth and Rome for its strategic points, with weapons of warfare not carnal, but spiritual, and mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds, and with victories bloodless and admirable over principalities and powers, and spiritual wickedness in high places.

The Gospel according to Luke, his "first treatise," is the record of "all that Jesus began to do and to teach;" this is the record of what the apostles of

Jesus began to do and to teach. As regards the Savior's church it is the book of beginnings. There is the beginning of spiritual enduement, the beginning of the Gospel ministry, the beginning of conversions, the beginning of organization, the beginning of emancipation from legalism, and the beginning of world-wide evangelization.

The evidential value of the book of Acts is unsurpassed. It is replete with facts that bear the stamp of genuineness. Fiction does not create sermons like that on Pentecost, or martyrdoms like that of Stephen, or conversions like that of Cornelius, or missionary heroism like that of Paul, or a society like the first church, united in love and Spirit-guided. At many points this book touches with delicacy and precision the geography, the history and the customs of the first century, both among the Jews and the Romans. The apostles Peter and James and Paul must forever hold their historic places side by side with Felix and Festus and Herod and Claudius and Nero, with this difference, that while the ordinary or even inferior careers of these Roman rulers are fully accounted for by quite the ordinary causes, the superior careers of these apostles are not at all to be accounted for except by the historic presence of the Holy Spirit bearing witness to Jesus, and glorifying him through them. The careers of these men, and their historic and spiritual creations, refuse to vanish from sight in the crucible of the hyper-higher-critics. If Paul should be torn from our reason, he

would still cling to our hearts, and they to him. But having him, reason demands more, and Christ and the Holy Spirit, as the exponents of his conversion and career, become intellectual necessities.

It is a matter of prime interest to know the conclusions of the latest learned criticism regarding this book. Prof. W. M. Ramsay, in his great work entitled "St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen," published only last year, has this to say:

"I may fairly claim to have entered on this investigation without any prejudice in favor of the conclusion which I shall now attempt to justify to the reader. On the contrary, I began with a mind unfavorable to it, for the ingenuity and apparent completeness of the Tubingen theory had at one time quite convinced me. It did not then lie in my line of life to investigate the subject minutely; but more recently I found myself often brought in contact with the book of Acts as an authority for the topography, antiquities, and society of Asia Minor. It was gradually borne in upon me that in various details the narrative showed marvelous truth. In fact, beginning with the fixed idea that the work was essentially a second century composition, and never relying on its evidence as trustworthy for first-century conditions, I gradually came to find it a useful ally in some obscure and difficult investigations."

Following this frank statement of his personal experience, the author proceeds to an equally frank dismissal of all theories that would make the book

a second-century production with mythical admixtures and tendency purposes, or that would make it a piece of ill-assorted second-century patch-work from documents A, B, C, etc., by redactors I., II., III., etc.

He says (page 10), "All theories of this class imply that the atmosphere and surroundings of the work are of the second-century type; and such theories have to be founded on a proof that the details are represented in an accurate way and colored by second-century ideas. The efforts of that earlier school of critics were directed to give the required proof, and in the attempt they displayed a misapprehension of the real character of ancient life and Roman history which is often astonishing, and which has been decisively disproved in the process of Roman historical investigation. All such theories belong to the pre-Mommsenian epoch of Roman history; they are now impossible for a rational and educated critic; and they hardly survive except in popular magazines and novels of the semi-religious order."

Quite explicitly the author states his working hypothesis. "Acts was written by a great historian (a first-class historian, he says elsewhere), a writer who set himself to record the facts as they occurred, a strong partisan, indeed, but raised above partiality by his perfect confidence that he had only to describe the facts as they occurred, in order to make the truth of Christianity and the honor of Paul apparent. To

a Gentile Christian, as the author of Acts was, the refusal of the Jews to listen to Paul, and their hatred of him as untrue to their pride of birth, must appear due to pure malignity; and the growing estrangement must seem to him the fault of the Jews alone. It is not my object to assume or to prove that there was no prejudice in the mind of Luke, no fault on the part of Paul; but only to examine whether the facts stated are trustworthy, and leave them to speak for themselves (as the author does). I shall argue that the book was composed by a personal friend and disciple of Paul, and if this be once established there will be no hesitation in accepting the primitive tradition that Luke was the author."

The reader is asked to bear with one more quotation from Prof. Ramsay's first chapter:

"The characterization of Paul in Acts is so detailed and individualized as to prove the author's personal acquaintance. Moreover, the Paul of Acts is the Paul that appears to us in his own letters, in his ways and his thoughts, in his educated tone of polished courtesy, in his quick and vehement temper, in the extraordinary versatility and adaptability which made him at home in every society, moving at ease in all surroundings, and everywhere the center of interest, whether he is the Socratic dialectician in the agora of Athens, or the rhetorician in its university, or conversing with kings and proconsuls, or advising in the council on shipboard, or cheering a broken-spirited crew to make one more effort for

life. Wherever Paul is, no one present has eyes for any but him. Such a view could not have been taken by a second century author. The church in the second century had passed into new circumstances, and was interested in quite different questions. The catastrophe of the persecution of Domitian, and the effect produced for the time on the attitude of the church by the deliberate attempt to suppress and destroy it on the part of the imperial government, made a great gulf between the first century and the second century of Christian history."

The leading arguments in favor of the authorship of Luke (in addition to the above) are,

First, The traditions of the early church, which with one consent (authorities tell us) ascribe the authorship to the author of the Gospel according to Luke.

Secondly, Similarity in literary style and method between Acts and the Gospel according to Luke. At least fifty words are peculiar to these two books. "Luke being acknowledged as the author of the Gospel, we know from that source what the characteristics of his style are; and it is maintained that these reappear in Acts to such an extent that we can account for the agreement only by referring the two productions to the same writer." —*Hackett.*

Thirdly, The evidence of what are called the "We-narratives." In several passages the writer uses the first personal pronoun in such a way as to indicate his companionship with Paul. These passages

are xvi. 10-17; xx. 5–xxi. 18; xxvii. and xxviii. Great weight attaches to them, inasmuch as any other explanation than that of companionship seems impossible. Meyer says, "The We-narrative, with its vivid and direct impress of personal participation, always remains a strong testimony in favor of a companion of the apostle as author of the whole book, of which that narrative is a part; to separate the subject of that narrative from the author of the whole, is a procedure of skeptical caprice." (See Essay XI.)

As to the date of the composition, the Variorum Bible says: "When and where the book of Acts was written must be a matter of mere conjecture. We only know that it must have been written after St. Luke's Gospel (75 A. D.)." This statement is perhaps too strong. However, there is little agreement among commentators. Hackett places it about 63; Lumby, 63 to 70; Meyer about 80; Ramsay places the composition of Luke's Gospel 79-81, and that of Acts somewhat later. His arguments are more than usually interesting, and one cannot but feel their force.

The chronology of the book of Acts is of the very first importance. It is practically the chronology of the New Testament. Luke, however, gives but few notes of time, and the difficulty of constructing a series of dates has been great. The prophecy of Agabus (xi. 28), and the date of the famine, extending, as Prof. Ramsay thinks, into the year 46 A. D. (see Note), fixes the time of one of Paul's visits to

Jerusalem. This the same author seeks to identify with the visit described by Paul himself in Gal. ii. 1-10. If, then, this visit may be placed as late as 46, and if the fourteen years named by Paul (Gal. ii. 1) includes the three years of his sojourn in Arabia, and dates therefore from his conversion, the latter event, together with the death of Stephen, would fall as early as 32 or 33. Some place the death of Stephen as early as 30; others as late as 36 or 37. Meyer decides upon 33 or 34. Prof. Ramsay's argument and conclusion, as stated above, are entitled to great weight.

Another date is given in xviii. 2. The edict of Claudius was in 52. It was probably in the same year that Paul met Priscilla and Aquila in Corinth.

One of the closest calculations of time anywhere to be found is given by Prof. Ramsay on page 289 of the work above named. "In A. D. 57, Passover fell on Thursday, April 7. The company sailed away from Philippi on the morning of Friday, April 15 (xx. 6), and the journey to Troas lasted till the fifth day, Tuesday, April 19. In Troas they stayed seven days, the first of which was April 19, and the last, Monday, April 25. Luke's rule is to state first the whole period of residence, then some detail of the residence. On the Sunday evening just before the start, the whole congregation at Troas met for the Agape; religious services were conducted late into the night; and in the early morning of Monday the party went on board and set sail. In A. D. 56,

58, 59, incidence of the Passover is not reconcilable with Luke's statistics, as is apparent from the attempts that have been made to torture his words into agreement."

Still another important note of time is the appointment by Nero of Portius Festus in the room of Felix (xxiv. 27). The date of this change assigned almost unanimously by scholars, is A. D. 60. Felix left Paul a prisoner in the hands of Festus. Under Festus Paul made his appeal to Cæsar, and was soon after sent to Rome. These circumstances fix the later years of Paul's life with almost absolute precision.

Perhaps it will never be found possible to give absolute dates except upon a few points. It is hoped the following list will commend itself to readers as having a fair consensus of scholarship in its favor.

The ascension of Jesus and the Pentecost following, May, A. D. 30; Death of Stephen and conversion of Paul, 32–33; Barnabas and Paul in Antioch, 42–43; Death of James and Herod Agrippa, 44; The famine foretold by Agabus, 45–46; Paul's first missionary journey, 47; Council in Jerusalem, 49–50; Paul's second missionary journey, 51–54; Paul's third missionary journey, 55–58; Paul's fifth and last journey to Jerusalem, 58; Paul's journey to Rome, 60; His first imprisonment under Nero, 61–63.

The book of Acts presents us with a historic basis for our Christian faith. The personalities of Peter and Paul in history, and the impress of these men,

especially the latter, upon their times and upon all succeeding times can never be doubted or denied. They are among the sanest and the stablest of all men, and they hazarded their lives in the furtherance of their mission. In the history that gathers itself around these two men as its principal figures, the natural and the higher-natural (what we call the miraculous) are inextricably interwoven. It is not possible to sift and to say, This is history and that is myth. The moment we attempt it, we find ourselves excluding as myths parts that stand related to the rest as cause to effect, and we find ourselves therefore in the dilemma of accepting, as historic, facts and persons rendered by our exclusions more causeless and mysterious than the things we had excluded. We are told on every hand that many a man of scientific temper and training is inclined, now-a-days, to grow reverent in the presence of the New Testament record of the higher-natural. Prof. Ramsay may be taken as an example. Speaking of "the marvels described in Acts," he says: "Twenty years ago I found it easy to dispose of them, but now-a-days probably not even the youngest among us finds himself able to maintain that we have mastered the secrets of nature, and determined the limits which divide the unknown from the impossible. That Paul believed himself to be the recipient of direct revelations from God, to be guided and controlled in his plans by direct interposition of the Holy Spirit, to be enabled by divine power to move the forces of nature in a

way that ordinary men cannot, is involved in this narrative. You must make up your minds to accept or reject it, but you cannot cut out the marvelous from the rest, nor can you believe that either Paul or this writer (Luke) was a mere victim of hallucinations."

The historic verities of the book of Acts and its fixed dates have an important bearing upon the writings of Paul and their value as witnessing to the truth of the Gospel narratives. Paul was a prisoner under Felix and Festus in 59 and 60. Before this date I. and II. Thessalonians, I. and II. Corinthians, Galatians and Romans were written. In all these letters Paul testifies to the crucifixion and the resurrection of Jesus, and he was not the man to put his life to the hazard for a myth or a fable or a fiction. From the resurrection of Jesus to the writing of the Book of Romans is in round numbers twenty-five years; Galatians and I. and II. Corinthians fall within the same period. Such books do not spring by mythical processes from hallucination or fiction or falsehood in so short a time, and within the memories of multitudes who as eye-witnesses of what really did happen were able and anxious to contradict them if they were false. Paul's testimony is practically contemporaneous; it is the testimony of one who was at the first an enemy of the cross; it was heralded by him boldly everywhere; and upon him through all his ministry there beat the fierce historic light of Judæa in the days of Josephus, and of Rome in the times of Livy and Tacitus. By such

lines of reason and research the doubters of to-day are to be convinced, if at all. "Never since the apostolic age has Christianity stood so proudly erect on her rendered reasons in the field of historic research as at the present hour." It is not enough to say that the historic basis of our Christian faith is left to us; it is confirmed to us by critical and scholarly research. It has been said, with striking force, that the mythical theory of Strauss died before its author, he having abandoned it before he died. We may rest assured that in a similarly relentless way time will weed out from the field of criticism the extremists and the erratics who are bound to be in it, and that sober scholarship will unceasingly protest to us that the apostles "did not follow cunningly devised fables when they made known to us the power and coming of our Lord Jesus," but that they were "eye-witnesses of his majesty."

One thing there is in the book of Acts absolutely, and not as an accidental, but as an essential part of it, and as inseparable from it as color and form and perfume from the petals of the rose. Eight times at least the phrase, "The Way," is used distinctively, and with technical precision. The passages are ix. 2; xvi. 17; xviii. 25; xviii. 26; xix. 9; xix. 23; xxii. 4, and xxiv. 22. In the Revised Bible this phrase is several times printed with a capital W. The first of them is indicative of all of them. "But Saul, yet breathing out threatening and slaughter against the dis-

ciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest, and asked of him letters to Damascus unto the synagogues, that if he found any that were of the Way, whether men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem." This must refer to Christ's "new and living Way," the way of salvation, the way by which the thousands came to him on the day of Pentecost, and by which the Ethiopian came, and Cornelius, and Lydia and her household, and the jailer and his household, and all the others whose conversions are at all fully described. This Way leads over the mountain of Calvary and down by the empty sepulcher, and on down by the waters of baptism, and so across to the land that is Christ's. It is the preaching of the incarnation, of the crucifixion, and of the resurrection of Jesus; it is the faith begotten by this preaching; it is the confession of this faith in penitence and baptism; and it includes the promise of the Holy Spirit. Absolutely this is the one well-worn highway that runs through the whole historic landscape that is presented to us in this book; it is the Way of Atonement, and we have been mournfully slow to find it and walk in it.

On the other hand there is no systematic theology here. We look in vain for dogmatics and counter-dogmatics. This book is delightfully innocent of isms. It is not marred by a single one of our denominational names. It reverently refrains from mischievous attempts to measure the immeasurable. There is no theometry in it. Upon this point one is

constrained to quote with entire approval Joseph Parker's vigorous words:

"I have made no attempt to find a formal theology in apostolic preaching. No such theology is there to be found. The supposed finding of it anywhere has been the heaviest cross which the Risen Christ has had to carry, and the greatest hindrance to the extension of his reign. Theology is as indefinable as life. It admits of multitudinous expression, and, like inspiration itself, must take the color of the individual soul that receives it. As theology deals with the Infinite, it cannot admit of complete and final statement in words. There is always a nameless quantity beyond. An infinite theology should create an infinite charity, yet probably there is less charity in theology than in any other subject of human thought."

Here is a church spiritually complete and doctrinally invincible, yet with no formal creed. Here are multitudes of believers, at one with God in Christ, made so by their faith, repentance, and baptism, coupled with the promise of forgiveness and the Holy Spirit, and by the apostles left wisely unvexed with the speculative and mysterious side of regeneration. Here are organization and enlargement proceeding under the rule of expediency, and no harm comes to the faith. Forever fact is better than theory; possession transcends speculation, and reality is the soul of religion. This is a book of realities. The death of Jesus is real; his resurrection is

real; his Lordship and Messiahship are real; faith in him is real; repentance and baptism are real; the promise of forgiveness is real and it is realized, and the atonement is real, because there is a real reconciliation between the repentant child and the forgiving Father. In this book there is a mighty march of realities; an invincible array of events; a conquering army of facts. The soul is at first led captive by them; then it delights in them; at last it rests in them, and finds that its rest is rest in the Father and in his Son Jesus Christ.

The author begs the reader to accept this volume for what it purports to be, simply and humbly a series of meditations thrown into the form of essays, with greater haste and many more interruptions than were to his taste. In availing himself of the liberties of the essayist, the author has been enabled to avoid on the one hand the necessary routine of the commentator, and on the other the conventional limitations and exhortations of the sermonizer.

The notes are selected with reference to their evidential value, the history and customs of the time, the constitution and life of the first church, and, above all, to the elucidation of the more difficult passages of the text. Where the well-known commentaries have been quoted, credit has been given. The plan imposes its own limitations, and it has required constant care and great resolution on the part of the author to keep within them.

Courtesy demands that the works that have been most helpful to the author in the preparation of the Essays should be named. Prof. B. A. Hinsdale's compact and thoughtful little book, "The Jewish-Christian Church," gave decided bent to the author's thought while he was yet a college boy. Dr. Philip Schaff's "History of the Apostolic Church" has been used as an authority upon many points. Farrar's "Life and Work of St. Paul," a work of wonderful eloquence and research, has been frequently helpful. Prof. W. M. Ramsay's recent critical work entitled "St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen" is indispensable to a thorough study of the last half of Acts.

Should the humble studies here presented incite the reader to a closer, wiser and more reverent reading of this key-book of the New Testament, and should it bring him into a sweeter relationship to the Church of Christ, his present "Spirit-bearing body" in the world, its object will be attained and its mission fulfilled.

I.

THE FIRST SERMON AFTER THE ASCENSION

"I say the pulpit (in the sober use
Of its legitimate, peculiar powers)
Must stand acknowledged while the world shall stand,
The most important and effectual guard,
Support and ornament of virtue's cause.
There stands the messenger of truth. There stands
The legate of the skies, his theme divine,
His office sacred, his credentials clear;
By him the violated law speaks out
Its thunders, and by him, in strains as sweet
As angels use, the Gospel whispers peace."

—*Cowper.*

I.

THE FIRST SERMON AFTER THE ASCENSION.

"Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ."—*Acts ii. 36.*

THE second chapter of The Acts is vital. The Holy Spirit is in it. It throbs with passionate eloquence. It has the thrill of a divine logic. It reaches a conclusion which immediately becomes a conviction. There ring through it the cries of thousands of penitent souls. It gives the divine response to these cries in its command to obedience and its promise of forgiveness. It heralds the hope of salvation to all that are afar off, and to the children's children of those who on that Pentecost day became the anointed of The Anointed. It holds the history of the beginning of the Church of Christ, and reveals to us in the apostolic steadfastness, and in the wholly fraternal relations of the first confessors, the power of the new, new story to regenerate men and transform society.

There are few chapters in the Bible comparable to this in point of historic and spiritual values. In Genesis we are told of the creation of man; here is the plan of his re-creation. In Exodus we still hear the thunders of Sinai giving forth a law under which

a mob of people, but yesterday out of slavery, is organized into an army and a nation; here the church of the crucified but living and reigning Christ is born. In the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, Messianic prophecy reaches its loftiest strains and its sweetest pathos; in this chapter that prophecy becomes history, and the One from whom we "hid as it were our faces," stands before us in resurrection regnancy, commanding us to look upon him in everlasting acknowledgment. The Apostle Paul's great chapter on the resurrection is anticipated by the Apostle Peter's daring, impulsive, irresistible testimony in this sermon. The thirteenth chapter of I. Corinthians teaches no higher form of love than is tacitly taught in this, the crucified One offering an abundant pardon to his murderers. The last chapter of Matthew, the last of Mark, and the last of Luke, contains, each, the risen Savior's last command, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you;" this contains the execution of that commission. It is in this chapter that we are come—"Unto Mount Sion, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the Firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God, the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of

sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel."

It was in the year of our Lord 30, on a Sunday, on a May day, probably the 27th, that the miracle of Pentecost took place. Forty days after his resurrection Jesus tarried visibly upon earth, giving to his chosen witnesses "many infallible proofs" of his resurrection, and therefore of his Messiahship. There came the last solemn meeting with him, when with pitiful yearning for their ancient theocracy they asked of him this impertinent question: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" This, then, was their final, political, unspiritual prayer! It is a startling indication of the antagonism between their ideals and the Master's own of his Messianic kingdom. Their tuition under Jesus, his persistent refusal to wear any crown save one of thorns, his death, his resurrection, had failed to disabuse their minds of that ingrained nationalism which, cherished on the part of the Jews as a nation, was ultimately their ruin. Christ's answer to this ill-timed prayer was indirect. He knew that one crowning miracle still was needed to "guide them into all truth." Previously he had promised them the Holy Spirit, and had indicated the office thereof in saying, "He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you." His present answer includes a command, a rebuke, and a reference to his former promise. "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons that the Father hath put in his

own power. But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." These are his last words upon earth, and they are a Godlike answer to a very human question. Their poor plans of over-matching Cæsar with "iron and blood" were limited to the "kingdom of Israel;" his matchless plan of over-matching all souls with truth and love found its boundaries only in "the uttermost parts of the earth."

One lesson at least his disciples had learned: they could wait. They returned from the scene of the Ascension, and tarried in the city of Jerusalem "till they were endued with power from on high."

On the day of Pentecost the Savior's promise was fulfilled. "There came from heaven a sound as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire, and it sat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." This was their enduement.

Guided, empowered thus, the Apostle Peter gave forth the greatest sermon ever preached. The names of the most notable preachers, and the immortal achievements of their "tongues of fire" are not wanting to memory when this assertion is made—Elijah, Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel,

Ezra, John the Baptist, Paul, Chrysostom, Savonarola, Luther, Whitefield, Edwards, Spurgeon, and many another, all of whose names thrill us more than those of kings and their counselors. There is one sermon never to be forgotten in such an estimate as we are attempting, and the name of the preacher of it is to be mentioned always reverently, and apart from any possible roll of names that are noblest among men. In its ethical and spiritual values the Sermon on the Mount is confessedly supreme. But its author does not present it as a completion. It is rather an inception. Not till Jesus bowed his head in death, saying, as he did so, "It is finished," was that sermon finished. In the Sermon on the Mount the death of Jesus is not foretold; there is no hint of his resurrection; the atonement is not taught. In these points it is surpassed by the sermon of Peter on that first Pentecost after the ascension. It was given to the apostle to complete what the Master had begun, or, rather, fully to declare the completions revealed in the living, dying, and rising of the Master. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto my Father." "Because I go unto my Father" —indicative of a finished work, a foundation in its completion, whereupon they, his disciples, were to build the house unto completion.

Peter's sermon was, therefore, to all preceding preachers an impossibility. To the Savior him-

self it would have been an anachronism. Its repetition or its equal is likewise an impossibility to all succeeding preachers, for the occasion, the inspiration and the results of Pentecost can never be duplicated.

Four factors are essential to a great sermon. In the first place there must be a great occasion. This Pentecost occasion had been in preparation through the whole of the nineteen Abrahamic centuries. God had this day in view when he said to Abraham, "In thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Sinai, with all that it means, the theocracy and all of its history, the prophecy, poetry and tragedy of the Jews through thirty generations, the temple worship with its endless lineage of priests and high priests, with its altars and victims and solemn mimicry of types and shadows, the majestic roll of Hebrew prophets beginning with Moses and ending with John the Baptist, the whole of Hebrew history from the golden age of Solomon to the awful days of the Maccabees,—all, all is but preparation for the completions that were preached on Pentecost. John the Baptist is but the last of the many forerunners of Christ. His cry, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," is the summary and conclusion, terse and terrible, in the very presence of the Christ, of the law and the prophets from Moses to Malachi. Standing as the representative not alone of Elijah, but of Isaiah as well, and of Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and Daniel, and the rest

of Christ's great-souled forerunners, standing as the last old covenant prophet and the best product of a mighty ancestry, "the greatest among them that are born of women," he introduces the Christ, saying, "Behold the lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." This man and all that for which he stands in his incompleteness—"the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he"—is likewise a factor in the preparation for the completions of Pentecost.

But, as already intimated, Christ himself is the essential and the immediate preparation for that event. The sermon goes back and looks into the face of prophecy, but only that it may find Christ there. The sixteenth Psalm is quoted, and now for the first time the veil is lifted from it, for only in the light of the crucifixion and the resurrection can the face of Moses, and of David, be unveiled. "Men and brethren, let me freely speak to you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulcher is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell (the world of the dead) neither his flesh did see corruption."

Christ in prophecy meets Christ in fact. "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a

man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." The life of Jesus, therefore, and all that was unique in it; his teaching, his miracles, his oneness with himself in word and deed, his death, being at once the necessary sequel and climax to his life, and his resurrection together with the infallible proofs of it, all, all is in the line of preparation for the Pentecost occasion. If the crucifixion may be likened to a mighty storm-cloud that passed in fury, raining divine blood upon the earth, the resurrection may be similarly likened to the indescribable glory of the sun, when, as though he had conquered the storm, he turns to paint upon its darkest breast his brightest bow of promised peace. The terror and the glory of the crucifixion and the resurrection were fresh in the minds of myriads of the people of Judæa, and their capital city had not yet recovered from the astonishment of the empty sepulcher when the day of Pentecost had fully come. The thousands of pilgrims who gathered from many lands to keep the feast in the Holy City could not have been ignorant of what had happened, for so early as the day of the resurrection it was the topic of conversation by the way-

side, and whoever had not heard it was immediately taken for a stranger. "These things were not done in a corner."

In addition to all this, and the last circumstance to be named as contributing to the occasion, was the harvest feast itself, the second of the three great festivals of the Jews. Worshiping strangers were present from many lands, and the city and the temple courts were thronged with devout and expectant crowds. Did they remember the young Galilean who had twice cleansed the temple of its company of monopolistic thieves, scourging them, and overthrowing their money tables? Did they recall the terrible energy of his words, and his look of divine indignation as he said, "Take these things hence; make not my Father's house a house of merchandise?" Did these recollections connect themselves with others fresher in mind of the dreadful noonday darkness that boded no good of his crucifixion, of the earthquake and the rending of the temple veil, and above all of his resurrection, quiet, divine, and terrible defiance as it was of Jewish malignity and Roman power? Did throngs of curious awe-struck people go now to gaze in at the empty sepulcher, and now upon the torn veil of the temple? Had the story of his appearances and disappearances gotten abroad, and were there hopes and fears on the part of friends and foes? Had he not promised that he would come again, and had he not threatened that of their temple not one stone should be left upon another that should not be

thrown down? One may not unwisely guess that there were forebodings of evil in many a heart, that there was expectancy on the part of all, and that when his disciples began to speak miraculously amidst the throngs in the temple courts there was intense excitement. It was a great occasion for which the history of centuries, and the tragedy of history, which to the worshipers there was the tragedy of the season, had prepared the way. Such preparations, such conditions, such an occasion can never return. All is unique.

The second essential to a great sermon is a great preacher. No man preaches taller than he is. It is not the office of the Holy Spirit to make suddenly and for the occasion giants of pigmies, sages of clowns, prophets of platform jobbers, or heroes of political cravens. From the pulpit wag, the sensationalist of the hour, the Cheap-John comic drawing card, you may expect smirks, jokes, the puns of last year's almanac, the slang of the street, the mere plausible tall-talk for which the multitudes having itching ears make constant demands. Our colleges and theological seminaries would perform a valuable service to mankind if they would make a business, metaphorically speaking, of strangling pulpit wags in embryo. The prostitution of the pulpit is not the least of the sins for which the trifler in divine things, the small dogmatic Doctor of Divinity, the evangelistic buffoon, and the mere political huckster of denominational eccentricities, must sometime answer.

But the pulpit and the sermon, as looked upon by the great and serious soul, present no opportunity for trifling. The Apostle Paul said, "We are the savour of death unto death, and of life unto life. Who is sufficient for these things? For we are not as many who corrupt the word of God, but as of sincerity, as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ." Chrysostom, already in his youth an accomplished rhetorician, rushed away and spent six years in lonesome study and devout meditation before he consented to enter the pulpit. Savonarola kindled his soul from the fires of Old Testament prophecy, and from his pulpit kindled the fires of revolution in Florence. With him preaching was so serious a business that when the papal agents sought to purchase his conscience with a cardinal's cap he merely said that he expected a cap some day red with his own blood. Jonathan Edwards "lived, an absorbed spirit, in the study. . . . He was a man of faith and prayer, a man who handled the things that are unseen as things really seen and felt; a mind shining through a beautiful face, . . . terribly in earnest, with a dreadful sense that sin was sin, Satan, Satan, and Christ, Christ." The man, the real man in the pulpit does realize that,

"THERE he stands
The legate of the skies, his theme divine,
His office sacred, his credentials clear.
By him, the violated law speaks out its thunders,
And by him, in strains as sweet as angels use,
The Gospel whispers peace."

Suited to the greatness of the Pentecost occasion there was a great preacher. The Apostle Peter was no longer "an ignorant fisherman," if he ever was that. He had had three years or more under this world's Master of masters, he had had spiritual experiences that were worth infinitely more to him than all the possible curricula of legalistic and rabbinical lore of his time, and above all else he was greatly and especially inspired for this day's work. Three years with Jesus, going about and doing good, hearing, seeing, practicing, puzzled, asking questions, grandly confessing Christ, and, from his standpoint as grandly rebuking him; as grandly also, still from his standpoint, out of crushed hopes and a broken heart, denying him; and after all compelled to read the meaning of these experiences in the light of the resurrection, and for that purpose endued with and guided by the Holy Spirit—this is the great man, greatly schooled, absolutely subdued, totally regenerated, positively inspired, who stands up matchlessly equipped for this matchless occasion.

The third essential to a great sermon is a great theme. The Spirit does not go forth with the sound as of a rushing, mighty wind, nor do the cloven tongues of fire appear for the declaration of trifles. Platitudes and attitudes are not the secret of heart-moving power. The meanness of the theme belittles the man and his pulpit; the grandeur of the theme exalts him and it. Out of the presumable science, philosophy, or politics of the day, there may come

forth any amount of pulpit oration, no doubt, ranging all the way from twaddle to gabble, and from gabble to fustian, and the twaddle and gabble and fustian may, indeed, have some seasoning of the Gospel in high, homeopathic solution; but are we to call this preaching? Jesus preached about so slight a thing as a lost coin, and a lost sheep, but his real theme was a lost soul, and out of that theme there grew the pearl of his parables, the one doubly and properly named "The Parable of the Prodigal Son," "The Parable of Fatherly Love." The themes of Jesus are simple, but they are sublime ere he leaves them, for into the commonplaces of earth he pours the spiritual content of faith and hope and love, of repentance and forgiveness and restoration, and he concludes by setting the whole of it in the perspective of endless days.

How can one fitly speak of the Apostle Peter's Pentecost theme! It is the theme of mankind, of the angels, and of the ages. It is the theme of prophecy preceding, and history succeeding, a certain date. Once it was the theme of types and shadows embodied in stately forms of ritualistic worship; as the shadows give place to substance, their theme becomes the exclusive one of apostles, martyrs, heroes and reformers, whose names are without number. It is still the theme, and shall ever be, of all preachers that are preachers, of all poets that are poets, of all martyrs and prophets and reformers and philoso-

phers who are genuinely so, and not the mere effigies of their respective classes.

When Whittier would overreach himself in the production of his finest ode, he can choose no theme but the Christ, "Our Master." In his "In Memoriam," Tennyson's friend, whom he tenderly remembers and fondly hopes again to meet, is less his theme than the Christ, through faith in whom he lifts up his hopes in poetic forms, till the poem becomes an anthem and a sermon, beginning with

> "Strong Son of God, immortal Love,
> Whom we, that have not seen thy face,
> By faith and faith alone embrace,
> Believing where we cannot prove."

And closing with

> "That God which ever lives and loves,
> One God, one law, one element,
> And one far off, divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves."

Our English epic, "Paradise Lost," cannot so much as get itself introduced by its great author without the most fervent expression of recovery through Christ. Disobedience, death, woe, loss of Eden, are only—

> "Till one greater Man
> Restore us, and regain the blissful seat."

It has been said there is no poetry without God. Since "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," let it be said quite as positively, there is no poetry without Christ. And if no poetry, then also

no philosophy, no history, no highest life of any sort.

Henry B. Smith, formerly of Union Theological Seminary, says, "God in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, is the burden of the Bible, and it is also the burden of history." In this connection he quotes the great Swiss historian, John Von Müller, who gives the results of his life-long labors, extracted from 1,733 authors, in the striking confession, that "Christ is the key to the history of the world. Not only does all harmonize with the mission of Christ, all is subordinated to it. When I saw this," he continues, "it was to me as wonderful and surprising as the light which Paul saw on the way to Damascus, the fulfillment of all hopes, the completion of all philosophy, the key to all the apparent contradictions of the physical and moral world; here is life and immortality. I marvel not at miracles; a far greater miracle has been reserved for our times, the spectacle of the connection of all human events in the establishment and preservation of the doctrine of Christ."

Christ was the Apostle Peter's theme on the day of Pentecost. Christ, of whom Herder has said, "He is the realized ideal of humanity;" whom Carlyle calls, "Our divinest symbol, a symbol of quite perennial, infinite character;" of whom Dorner says, "He is the perfect revelation of God, and at the same time the perfection of humanity;" of whose life Schaff says, "It is the moral miracle of history;"—Christ, at whose feet, inerrant, and wounded, as at the feet of

the Master supreme, the greatest masters of earth unanimously, reverently bow.

Note the argument of the sermon. Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God by miracles and wonders and signs; delivered by the counsel of God, and slain by wicked hands; by God raised from the dead, exalted, seated at the right hand of the Most High till his foes are his footstool; and, finally, giver of the Holy Spirit,—these are the mighty passages of directly inspired, impetuous, daring, apostolic testimony.

The climax, the conclusion, the effective, heart-piercing appeal of the sermon, are all reached in the words that are chosen to stand as the caption of this essay: "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." There is no other theme, there is no other conclusion for the pulpit. The platform, the forum, the academic chair, may deal with inferior themes, and reach other, minor conclusions, but not the pulpit. The moment the pulpit undertakes to present or represent any other than Christ, or to enforce truth other than and inferior to this, namely, that God hath made him Lord and Christ, that moment the pulpit ceases to be the pulpit, and becomes by necessity something other, but not better. Forever and forever the Christological preacher, and therefore also the evangelistic one, must find in this sermon his model. Surely it is with accurate, homiletic in-

stinct that Joseph Parker has said, "As a matter of fact, the Apostle Peter preached the only sermon that any Christian minister is ever at liberty to preach. This discourse of Peter's is not nineteen centuries old. This is the model sermon. This is the evangelistic doctrine."

The occasion was unique. To match it the preacher was especially chosen, peculiarly trained, divinely-inspired. His theme was Christ. One thing remains to make the sermon great; its effect was great.

Three thousand were "pricked in the heart;" three thousand became inquirers, and were told explicitly what to do; they did it exactly. They received the promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit, and in their rebirth the church of Christ was born. Significant beyond the fact that three thousand souls were turned to Christ is the question that they asked, and the answer it received. They have passed away from earth, but their question abides; it is the soul-cry of humanity, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" And the answer to it, given under such circumstances, and with such sanctions, must be an abiding answer. If the pulpit is unique, if its theme is unique, if its peculiar province is to call forth this question, then shall not its answer be likewise unique, and shall it not be explicit, and forever imperative? "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy

Spirit." Repentance! Baptism! Remission! the Holy Spirit!—here is the atonement! "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," and this is the way reconciliation began on that first Pentecost after the ascension, in the persons of thrice a thousand souls.

This sermon is great in that it completely presents the Gospel in its completion.

The manner of it is a model, the Apostle Peter having been greatly schooled and greatly inspired for its delivery.

It is great in its exclusion of things irrelevant. Not one word is said about restoring the kingdom again to Israel, though this was the last thought uppermost with the disciples at the moment of Christ's ascension.

It is Christological rather than theological, and inductive rather than deductive. In a very great manner it is barren, therefore, of metaphysics, theories, dogmas, and the general guess-work impudently conceived and dogmatically enforced of all merely rationalistic, because merely syllogistic, and therefore merely logic-chopped theology.

It is great in presenting Christ as he presented himself, "Approved of God by miracles and signs and wonders which God did by him;" crucified, buried, risen, exalted, expectant, regnant, claiming the world at the price of his blood.

It is great in moving the hearts of the people as fields of grain are shaken by the wind. At once to

enlighten the mind, to touch the heart, and to bend man's stubborn will before God's will till cries for mercy are forthcoming is the most majestic effect of speech.

It is great in its revelation of the new way of access to God "through the veil, that is to say, his flesh," commanding that "the heart be sprinkled from an evil conscience, and the body washed with pure water."

It is great in its promise of the Holy Spirit, and in its extension of that promise to "all that are afar off." It is the greatest sermon ever preached.

II.

THE FIRST CHURCH

"Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."—*Eph. v. 25-27.*

"The church is no other than the outward, visible representation of the inward communion of believers with the Redeemer and with one another."—*Neander.*

"Over against the divisions of race and continent the Church raises still its witness to the possibility of a universal brotherhood; over against despair and dispersion it speaks of faith and the unity of knowledge; over against pessimism it lifts up a perpetual Eucharist."—*Rev. W. Lock.*

II.

THE FIRST CHURCH.

"Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." —*Acts ii. 41.*

THE word received was the conclusion of the Apostle Peter's sermon and his answer to the inquirers' question. This was the conclusion: "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." This was the answer to the question: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." This conclusion and this answer were respectively creed and charter of the new-born church. They "received his word;" that is, they accepted the creed and complied with the conditions of the charter. A great change had come over them in the few weeks since they clamored for the crucifixion of Jesus, and hooted around his cross, and wagged their heads in mockery while he expired in majesty. The miracle of the tongues and the power of the Holy Spirit bringing proof of the resurrection of Jesus, had broken up the fountains of the great deep in the hearts of the hitherto impenitent multitudes, and

many doors flew open now where the Master himself had stood knocking in vain. They "were baptized;" that is, they acknowledged their faith in Christ openly; they submitted, in a figure, to die with him that they might rise with him; they took the step that severed them from the old, and brought them into new relations with God. In baptism they reached the culmination of conversion, for conversion is immersion—the immersion of the mind in the mind of Jesus; of the heart in the love of Jesus; of the will in the purpose of Jesus; of the body in water in the name of Jesus, coupled with the name of his Father and ours, and with the name of the Holy Spirit, his and ours. So the three thousand "were added." It is the Pentecostal plan of the addition, and therefore also of the multiplication of believers.

Not a word is said about any further basis of membership than this. Whatever brought a soul into Christ brought him also into the church of Christ, and the basis of the union of souls in the Head of the church was by necessity the basis of their union and communion in the body of it. Thus the question of Christian union is reduced to a mathematical exactness. The last word to be said on the subject is this: union with Christ is union with his church, and those who are members of his body are therefore "members one of another." We have made many sad and foolish schisms, but the saddest and foolishest is that between Christ himself and his own

body. We cannot, somehow, seem to understand that the church is his, and that all who are members of him are by necessity members of it. Our difficulties are of our own creation. We have failed to understand the primary union of the Savior with the saved, of the Lord with his domain, of the Head with his own proper body, speaking after the fashion of the Apostle Paul; and having gone wrong in this primary matter, we have been going wrong by sequence in all secondary ones. Foolishly and with measurable impudence we have dragged in our creeds and polities; we demand places for our clashing isms, and recognition of our pet notions; we talk of our denominations, and propose federation of THEM, as though they were the things to be united; on the contrary, the things to be united are Christ and ourselves. When you and I are united with Christ, and consequently with one another, we are then to go anywhere in this world and claim our place at any communion table that is his. In defiance of dogmas and theologies and theometries and rituals and polities and isms and schisms and ecclesiasticisms and hierarchies, high or low, I have a right to the bread wherever it is broken in his name, and to the wine wherever it speaks to me of his blood—I have a right to it if I am his. We need to reassert the primal, Pentecostal "addition" of believers to believers. That mode of "addition" is the solution of the whole problem, and its proper and practical assertion would forever forestall such talk as is too common

and commonplace about the variously proposed bases of union, such as "The Apostles' Creed," noble, and true, perhaps, and hoary with age, though the apostles themselves never dreamed of it; and "The Quadrilateral," proposed as a basis of union by such as, claiming the Apostolic Succession, have evidently lost the apostolic simplicity; and the Evangelical Alliance creed, and any number of things except the one, Pentecostal, right thing. If we knew it, all Christians are already united in Christ just as the Pentecost thousands were; they all claim the same eternal Father, they are all journeying to the same heaven; they have only to drop their extraneous, and superfluous, and mischievous peculiarities, and bravely acknowledge their existing oneness.

If the first church was by birth a unit, by its education it continued its coherence. "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread and in prayers." The teaching and fellowship of the apostles, prayer and the eucharist, are the divinely-appointed means of ordination and of co-ordination in the church of Christ. The writer of Acts leaves the phrase "apostles' teaching" unqualified, seemingly suggesting that their doctrines were so well known as to need no iteration. And we do know, if we stop to think about it, precisely what they taught. The Pentecost sermon is a summary of it; the Gospels are an enlargement of it; the epistles are the completion of it. Day after day they must have repeated the

story of Christ's resurrection, and from that they must have gone back in memory to dwell upon his life, full of childlike simplicity and more than manlike perplexity, and clothed at once in warp and woof of humility and majesty. They must have had occasion, as all pastors have, to enforce his style of forbearance and forgiveness, many and many a time, upon his fledgling followers; often they must have described with accuracy and with the enthusiasm of a vivid remembrance his walk upon the waves when tossed by the night winds, his transfiguration, sunlike pre-robing of glory for a season's communion with glorified ones, and his strange semi-earthly, semi-heavenly appearances after his resurrection; and very frequently they must have turned to their Scriptures and to the temple-worship proceeding daily around them, to find many a prophetic promise and sacramental type of him. The apostles were not theologians; they had not so degenerated. Christological! Their teachings were wholly that. The Holy Spirit was not given to make theologians of them, but to glorify Christ through them. They had been trained by Jesus to trust God as children trust a Father, and to believe in himself as both Lord and Christ, and to go about doing good. They were entirely and beneficently innocent of all speculations about Monarchianism, and Eutychianism, and Monophysitism, and Monothelitism, and Supra-lapsarianism, and Sublapsarianism, and the Kenosis, and the Krypsis, and the *genus ideo-*

maticum, and the *genus apotelesmaticum*, and the *genus majestaticum*, and of transubstantiation, and consubstantiation, and eternal generation, and eternal procession, and co-substantiality and tri-personality, and the *volipræsentia*, or the *multivolipræsentia* of Christ as opposed to the absolute ubiquity of his humanity from his very infancy—O thank God! The apostles were beneficently innocent of all this. They were too reverent and practical to indulge in such meddlesome and useless speculations. Not until the ill-starred times when there came an alliance between the Christian faith on the one hand and Greek speculation and Roman dogmatism on the other, and not till men lost their reverence in the heat and impetuosity of their pursuit of partisan ends was it possible to indulge in the "profane and vain babblings" that encompass the whole history of theology. The members of the first church, "continuing steadfastly in the doctrine of the apostles," lived in the enjoyment of a loving loyalty to the personal Lordship of Jesus, and since Jesus was a brother and a friend and a reality to them they would have speculated quite as readily about one another as about him. Even John, the most mystical of all the twelve, kept through the whole of his life to a reverently simple and absolute declaration of that "Word," which he had seen, which he had looked upon, which he had heard, and his hands had handled (I. John i. 1-3). From that

he proceeded immediately to practical matters, forbidding speculative ones.

It is needful to note in a word that the first church enjoyed the fellowship of the apostles together with their teaching. Forever and forever the teachers whom Christ appoints are to be the "fellows," the friends and brothers of those whom they are appointed to teach. The lords over the heritage, with their secular scepters and high miters, have ceased to be apostolical, since with albs and crosiers and palliums and red caps and clerical titles, and every possible distinction between themselves and "the laity," from the peculiar cut of a coat to the supercilious assumption of infallibility, such teachers have separated themselves from their disciples. The fellowship, the friendship, the environment of the teacher is essential to the completest efficacy of his teaching. Hence Jesus lived among his disciples. Hence the apostles lived among the members of the first church. Hence the true pastor must live among his people, and the ringing of door-bells is quite as essential as the announcing of texts. From the fellowship of the apostles, and the fellowship of all true teachers and pastors, out through the medium of the church there is to go forth at last that fellowship, which, breaking down all caste, is to compass the whole earth,—

> "When each shall find his own in all men's good,
> And all men dwell in noble brotherhood,"

and when each man's title to reverence shall pro-

ceed from his ministerial rather than his magisterial service to men.

The first church continued steadfastly in the breaking of bread and in prayers. According to the forty-sixth verse of the chapter this "breaking of bread" was a daily service. It was modeled after Christ's last supper with his disciples, which was a full meal; after that the bread and the wine were passed, blessed with his blessing, and set apart forever to the remembrance of him. Gradually changes came both in the time and the manner of the observance of this communal supper and communion service. In the twentieth chapter of Acts we already have indications that the daily feast had in the Gentile church at Troas passed over into a weekly one, and that the first day of the week was the statedly appointed time for it. But that the communal supper, or love-feast, as it has been called, and the communion service were separated during the days of the apostles is not quite clear. There are indications of such separation in the Apostle Paul's instructions to the Corinthian church, for in this church the supper fell under shameful abuses, "one being hungry and another drunken." The apostle thereupon rebuked them, saying, "What? Have you not houses to eat and drink in? Or despise ye the church of God, and shame them that are poor?" Then, following this suggestion that they should eat and drink in their own houses, that is, that they should take their own suppers in their own houses, he emphasizes in the

most solemn way the Lord's supper as commemorative of the Lord's death. This much is certain: the daily communal supper was never commanded by Christ, and from its nature it could not become permanent in the church. The communion service, on the other hand, was commanded, and its nature bespeaks its permanence.

Before Jesus died, in anticipation of his death, he broke the bread and blessed it, and he blessed the wine, and gave both to his disciples as age-long, sacred symbols of himself, afflicted though he was, and despised, and rejected of men, yet devoted to men, and already in intent as truly dead as when he died. Oh, the love, the courage, the dauntlessness of Jesus! With a present tense preceding his death he calmly gave to his disciples and to the world a reminder of something that was yet to be. "This is my body which is broken for you!" "This cup is the New Testament in my blood!" He is a Lamb "slain from the foundation of the world." In intent, and no less in fact, the atonement runs through the whole of his life, of which his death is but the climax, of which his resurrection is the seal, it being his second and final transfiguration never to be followed by humiliation. The death of Jesus is not an accident. It is an integral part of his life. To remember his death is to remember him, and his atoning death is his atoning self, given, devoted, in anticipation slain, slain from the first, yet in resurrection living forever.

In their direct way of looking at it, the Pentecost Christians could never have dreamed of anything so shocking as the Mediæval doctrine of "blood atonement." To them the death-tragedy of Jesus was the culmination of his life-tragedy, the two being bound together as antecedent and consequent, thus forming one mighty movement of the one transcendent life, the whole acknowledged of God and sealed by him in the resurrection of his Son from the dead. And where is the efficacy of this mingled tragedy of life and death and resurrection? On Pentecost it pricked the thousands in their hearts; they cried in penitence and baptism unto God, and were forgiven, and that was their atonement. After repentance and forgiveness, to talk about a divine justice or a divine law still to be "satisfied," is ill-timed and illogical. A father who has looked upon the face of his penitent child and has forgiven him, is already satisfied, and more sweetly so than by any possible other "payment." To the first Christian church, therefore, the communion service must have been a weekly reminder of Christ and all that the apostles were continually telling about him; and of that pricking in the heart which brought them to repentance and baptism; and of the Holy Spirit's blessed promise thereupon of the forgiveness of their sins. In the light of this chapter the atonement, the "*unio mystica*," well-nigh ceases to be mystical; theology becomes Christology, and the Lord's supper becomes a Father's feast, with the Elder Brother and all the

children at table, breaking bread from one loaf, partaking of wine from a common cup, remembering the one body and the one blood of the one Greatest Brother, and not forgetting that "God hath made of one blood (is it not the same?) all the nations of the earth." The communion service thus, when properly seen from the standpoint of the first church, will set our eyes looking upon the simplest, sweetest sort, not of doctrinal but of practical and actual atonement, and it will set them looking also both Godward and manward in heaven-high and world-wide ways.

However, this question should not be studied in the spirit of triumphant rationalism, but in caution and reverence, since there are positions that easily offer themselves to a hasty logic based upon the rough and ready dealings of man with man, rather than upon the revealed dealings of God with man.

Though the first church must be exonerated from the Romish doctrine of the vicarious atonement, it must nevertheless have been influenced in its views of the death of Jesus by the sacrificial system upon which, through all their generations, the Jews had been trained to look with utmost reverence. The standpoint of John the Baptist is evidently that also of John the Apostle, and is therefore indicative of that of the apostolic church: "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." John Ruskin, revolting with all of his characteristically seer-like soul from much that is taught in theology, has, nevertheless, with accurate, spiritual

and scriptural insight, avoided an extreme that has proved too great an allurement to many a smaller soul, namely, that the death of Jesus has no other than ethical and evidential values for us. The following paragraph is from his "The Art of England," and is so fair a comment upon many a passage in the New Testament as to deserve a place in every such discussion as this:

"None of you who have the least acquaintance with the general tenor of my own teaching will suspect in me any bias toward the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice as it is taught by the modern evangelical preacher. But the great mystery of the idea of sacrifice itself, which has been manifested as one united and solemn instinct by all thoughtful and affectionate races since the wide world became peopled, is founded upon the secret truth of benevolent energy which all men who have tried to gain it have learned—that you cannot save men from death but by facing it for them, nor from sin but by resisting it for them. It is, on the contrary, the favorite and the worst falsehood of modern infidel morality, that you serve your fellow-creatures best by getting a percentage out of their pockets, and will best provide for starving multitudes by regaling yourselves. Some day or other—probably now very soon—too probably by heavy afflictions of the state, we shall be taught that it is not so; and that all the true good and glory, even of this world—not to speak of any that is to come—must be bought still, as it always has been, with our toil and with our

tears. That is the final doctrine, the inevitable one, not of Christianity only, but of all heroic faith and heroic being; and the first trial question of a true soul must be—Have I a religion, have I a country, have I a love, that I am ready to die for?"

The first church was a praying church. It was ushered in by the way of prayer, for in that upper room previous to the day of Pentecost "they all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication." It was nourished by prayer, and within the apostolic environment it breathed the atmosphere of prayer. The church of Christ is unique in that it is a praying brotherhood. There are secret fraternities, and commercial fraternities, and fighting fraternities, but the secret and the wealth and the weapons of the church are in prayer. The effectual, fervent prayers of the first church were not without startling efficacy. When they communed they prayed; when they ordained deacons they prayed; when they were persecuted they prayed; if they died, they died praying, and saying, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." When Peter was in prison they prayed daily for him, and even while they prayed he stood, to their surprise, knocking at their gate. For the angel of the Lord answered their prayers, taking him from the sleeping soldiers, and leading him forth through prison doors and iron gates that "opened of their own accord." A prayerless Christian is an anomaly, and likewise a prayerless church. Prayer belongs among the "all things" that Jesus commanded to be taught. "Jesus

himself," says Mozoomdar, "lived and died in prayer." "They saw prayer when they beheld Jesus praying, for as he prayed the fashion of his countenance was altered."

"There is more wisdom in a whispered prayer
Than in the ancient lore of all the schools;
The soul upon its knees holds God by the hand."

The laws of prayer may be traced in the prayers of the first church. They who continued in prayer were all believers in Christ as their Savior, and therefore in God as their Father; such belief is the first law of Christian prayer.

They were all obedient, having done punctually and precisely what they were commanded to do; this is the second law of Christian prayer.

Unarmed and in the midst of enemies who would soon let loose the fires of persecution upon them, they were helpless without God, and therefore dependent upon him; this is the third law of Christian prayer.

As shown in their community of distribution, these Christians loved, and love is a sacred condition of prayer.

"He prayeth best who loveth best
All things both great and small;
For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all."

"Prayer is the highest form of speech that human lips can try."

"A man holds himself at his best when he prays."

Prayer is the other half of work. It is the province of the Christian to work and pray.

The first church "had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need." This was a voluntary, not a compulsory communism. The right to their own property both before and after the sale of it was recognized by the Apostle Peter in the case of Ananias and Sapphira. "Whiles it remained was it not thine own? And after it was sold was it not in thine own power?" These people were condemned for their attempted deception, not for their retention of a portion of their goods. Doubtless many of the members of this church retained their own houses, as was the case with Mary the mother of John, in whose house they gathered to pray for Peter when he was in prison, Acts xii. 12. The common store did not enrich the apostles, for they said to the lame man at the gate of the temple, "Silver and gold have we none." Yet, that the goods were "laid at the apostles' feet" indicates that they had the entire control of them. Their use of them therefore must have been strictly for the good of the community, and not at all for personal gain.

The dangers to which the first Christians were subjected, their common faith and love, and their expectation of the early reappearance of Jesus, led many of them to this voluntary surrender of their goods.

After all, the communism was in distribution rather

than in possession. The first church had no claim on the goods of its members, it was simply a storehouse for their free-will offerings. There was no confiscation on the part of the church, and no obligation on the part of the members except the constraint of their enthusiasm and love. But in distribution there was the strictest obligation resting on the apostles to see that every one was supplied according to his needs. As the church grew the work became too great for them, and hence the appointment of the seven deacons to whom the service of the "tables" was committed, the apostles giving themselves to the preaching of the word.

Such a communism of the storing and distribution of voluntary gifts is not traceable in any of the Gentile churches, and it seems to have led ultimately to the poverty and dependence of many in the first church, for in later years the Apostle Paul went about among the Gentile Christians in Macedonia and Achaia soliciting help for the "poor saints which were in Jerusalem."

In close and profitable study the accidental must be distinguished from the essential. In the first church the teaching and fellowship of the apostles, the breaking of bread, and the prayers, were essential and permanent. The canceling of any of these factors would cripple any church. But the communism was accidental and transient, and passed away with the transient conditions from which it arose. The essential and abiding principle underneath this outer

communism was the spirit of brotherly kindness, under the constraint of which none of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own. True stewards of God's gifts, they held their property at the service of his church. This was the abiding, social soul of Christianity, and it was manifested as truly by the churches of Macedonia and Achaia in their gifts to the "poor saints" far away, and of another and erstwhile hateful lineage, as by those who in Jerusalem sold their lands and laid the prices at the apostles' feet. Out of this, the abiding social soul of Christianity, there has gone forth through all the centuries that bear the name of our Lord the innumerable benefactions of his church. Schools, hospitals, asylums, churches, missions and martyrdoms have sprung from it; and the most advanced of civilizations owe themselves to it; and even revolutions have been indirectly due to it when under the constraint of tyranny this spirit, misguided, has become an explosive force among the multitudes of men. This fraternal spirit in Christianity is coming more and more to express itself in forms of popular government and in altruistic ways. It must become regnant throughout all the arts of production, and the avenues of distribution, till justice and charity consort together, and the hungry are fed, and the naked are clothed, and the imprisoned are visited, and the sick and the sinful are ministered unto, each according to his crying needs. Beyond all notions of enforced state communism, which can

have no warrant from the book of Acts, there rises the lofty socialism of the Master himself, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." And if the decisions of the judgment day are to rest upon justice, and if justice is to be wedded with charity in the ultimate righting of social wrongs, if this is the conclusion arrived at by our wisest leaders of thought, then let it be remembered that this also is the conclusion of Christ's pictured day of awful reckonings, and that the parable of ministrations becomes on the one hand the parable of sweetest invitations, and on the other of eternal condemnations. Christianity is not communism, but it is fraternism, and to the cold and hungry brother at the door it does not say, "Depart in peace; be ye warmed and filled."

III.

THE FIRST PERSECUTION

"But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father who is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."—*Matt. v. 44, 45.*

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchers of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves that ye are children of them who killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the judgment of hell?"—*Matt. xxiii. 29-33.*

III.

THE FIRST PERSECUTION.

"And as they spake to the people, the priests, and the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees came upon them, being grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead."—*Acts iv. 1, 2.*

A REMARKABLE source of grief surely! This is not irony, it is history. Men may be known by what they are accustomed to weep over, as well as by what they delight to laugh at. They wagged their heads when Jesus died; they now mourn when he is preached. Thus in their mockery and their mourning these wretched misleaders of God's ancient, chosen, and glorious people, have given their measure to all the world, and the world has rewarded them by keeping their remembrance as a hiss and a by-word. In proportion to its valuation of Jesus the world metes out execration, not to his murderers, but to their cherished hardness of heart, and the brighter the glory that gathers round him the deeper the darkness into which their sins are cast.

Christ's resurrection was God's answer to the nation that murdered Christ. The empty sepulcher and the miracle of Pentecost were the chagrin and the confusion of the haters of Jesus. The believers suddenly became an army numbering thousands; they

were gathered into a community, many wonders and signs were done by the apostles, and fear came upon every soul. The crucifixion darkness that gathered at noonday, the earthquake and the rending of the temple veil, the report of the resurrection and the miracle of tongues, the new community and the concontinued wonder-working of the apostles, was the terrible array, mightier than an army with banners, which God brought to front the consciences of his rebellious and gainsaying people. By the voice of this mighty array, as in the most majestic, mournful language of forsaken love, God was still calling to his people, and saying, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." This is the Pentecost translation of Isaiah's tongue of fire, and of Jeremiah's mourning, and of Ezekiel's rebukes, plus the superlative emphasis of Christ's own tears and blood and empty tomb.

For a while the leaders of the nation were stupefied, and they offered no resistance. The apostles preached in the temple courts, and the multitude of believers increased daily. These days were even more crucial to the nation than the ones that embraced the trial and the crucifixion of Jesus, for at that time the divine demonstration was not yet complete, and there was room still for excuse and prayer and forgiveness. Therefore the prayer of the passion, "Father, forgive them; they know not what

they do." But now the evidence is all in; the demonstration is complete; Christ has arisen, and the Holy Spirit has been given; whom they have rejected, God has accepted, and the stone of their stumbling has been made by Jehovah himself the head of the corner. There is no longer any excuse. For days they have nothing to say, and they seem cast in the balance, hesitating, terrified. There are moments freighted with destinies, and these Pentecostal days, the birth season of the church of the Redeemer, were the last days of grace extended to the "children of Abraham," the revilers of Jesus. The evidence of the Holy Spirit witnessing to the resurrection of Jesus in miracles of speech, and with heart-piercings, and gifts of healing, was before them daily, and in the very precincts of the temple, for "these things were not done in a corner." It was their last call, and it was crucial. Beyond this no offer could be made, for it was the call of the Holy Spirit dwelling in the community of the believers, glorifying Jesus, and convincing the unbelievers of sin because they had rejected him; of righteousness because God had accepted him; and of judgment because by the resurrection of Jesus the prince of this world was judged. From the day of Pentecost their resistance of the apostles was a resistance of the Holy Spirit, and their persecution of the spiritually endued community of believers was a final blasphemy.

The occasion of the first persecution was the heal-

ing of the lame man and the sermon that followed. Under a vine of gold with clusters of golden grapes as large as a man's body, sat this crippled, life-long beggar. It is the mark of a decadent religion to adorn its temples and neglect its men. Forty and six years had this temple been building, and the hammers of its workmen were still heard in it, and the expenditure upon its marble and gold was incalculable. It seems like the irony of fate that this beggar should have been carried daily and placed like a hungry, ragged, human statue in the midst of this gilded luxuriance of architecture and art. Too frequently it still happens that our temples have the double adornment of beautiful gates and begging men. Encircled by this vine of gold, and standing amidst the clusters of its fruit of gold, the apostles stooped to take the ragged cripple by the hand, and to say to him, "Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee; in the name of Jesus of Nazareth rise up and walk." Better than the building of a temple is the healing of a man. Immediately the man, a cripple from his birth, leaped and walked, and entered with them into the temple, walking and leaping and praising God. All at once the crowds of well-to-do worshipers became interested in their beggar brother, and in his benefactors, whom he held by the hands. This gave the Apostle Peter the occasion for another sermon, the duplicate in tone and substance of the one on Pentecost. It was another of those unique occasions furnished providentially to

the apostles in the early days of their evidential work. The sermon is a marvel of daring, accusing, excusing, and appealing speech, backed by an incarnate miracle; for still as the apostle speaks, the man who never had walked stands and leaps, and the wondering worshipers stand staring, and listening that they may learn the secret of the miracle. And when they have learned it curiosity has passed over into conviction, for once more they hear nothing but the story of the Christ crucified at their hands, raised up by the hand of God, and proving his potency to forgive by his potency to heal. The results of Pentecost were well nigh repeated, the three thousand having become five thousand before that day's eventide. It was a beneficent work, full of holy teaching, and love, and healing, and hope, and forgiveness. There was nothing unseemly in the conduct of the apostles; they were unarmed, they stirred up no seditions, they made no threats. Why, then, were they persecuted?

Their words were sharper than a two-edged sword, and their teachings more revolutionary than an army with banners. They were persecuted for the same reason that Jesus was persecuted; the prince of this world had nothing in him, but everything to oppose in him. In an age of intense and bitter hatreds Jesus and his apostles preached love; in the midst of a nation rankling with every possible retaliation they preached forbearance and forgiveness; into a world governed by armies and swords and iron scep-

ters they came with broken reeds, and thorn-crowned brows, preaching disarmament. Immediately after Jesus had fed the five thousand men with five barley loaves and two small fishes they came to take him by force and make him a king. What a commissariat he would have been for an army marching against Rome! Narrow nationalists and hateful trucklers that they were, that was the thought uppermost with them—they would make him a king, and their armies should have leadership, and no need of foraging. But when Jesus refused to be such a king, and when he persisted in still going about and doing good, preaching peace, and forbearance, and forgiveness, their disappointment and indignation knew no bounds. At last, after the resurrection of Lazarus, they gave expression to the full secret of their opposition to him in these words: "What do we? for this man doeth many miracles. If we let him thus alone all men will believe on him, and the Romans will come and take away our place and nation." (John xi. 47, 48; xii. 10, 11). They even consulted that they might put Lazarus also to death, "Because that by reason of him many of the Jews went away and believed on Jesus." To a nation, therefore, hating Cæsar worse than Satan Jesus was repugnant. Hence at last he was called upon to die in political martyrdom to his own peace principles.

There were religious reasons also for their opposition to Jesus and his apostles. Jesus exposed mercilessly the hollowness of Phariseeism and the

heresies of Sadduceeism. Their slavery to Sabbath rituals, their mummery of endless ceremonialism, their self-righteous disdain of everybody not of their own set, their street-corner praying, their vainglorious alms-giving, their tithing of mint, their neglect of mercy, their hand-washings and their heart-hardenings, their utter self-abandonment to forms and rituals and hatred and hypocrisy and superciliousness were met on the part of Jesus with stern rebuke, and utter condemnation, and warnings against an eternal hell. Upon them at last Jesus fixed his stigma forever; they felt its sting, and they never forgave him for it: "Whited sepulchers, full of dead men's bones!" When the time came for it their reply was, "Crucify him! Crucify him!"

To a people utterly false nothing is more repulsive than truth, and to a people utterly hateful nothing can be more revolutionary than love. Hence it was that the light shined in darkness and the darkness comprehended it not; that Jesus came to his own and his own received him not.

With such a man in such a nation, one of two things was inevitable; they must repent, or he must perish. They had no intention of the former, he had a full intention of the latter; that is, he intended to perish that he might not perish. From the first, Jesus knew that his face was toward the cross. When Peter acknowledged him as the Christ, the Son of the living God, Jesus in turn acknowledged the title, and immediately pointed out to his aston-

ished disciple the pathway that a being wearing worthily such a title must take through this world. From the day of his temptation and triumph in the wilderness, it was as clear to him as a mathematical demonstration, that love can be made perfect only in loving one's enemies, and in loving them enough to die for them, and in loving them unto death, should they demand it. Likewise that forgiveness can be made perfect only in forgiving as long as the breath of prayer can move to repentance; and that non-retaliation can find its perfection only in dying, not in cursing, nor even in commanding the wrath of legions of angels to go forth smiting. If instead of dying Jesus had retaliated, had he smitten the nation with sudden destruction, there would have been an end of love and of forbearance, and a mockery of his own peace principles. Had he given himself to malediction instead of prayers, he would have been false to his own sermons and parables; if being reviled he had reviled, if suffering he had threatened, his superlative teaching would have fallen feebly upon the world as having no complement in superlative conduct. In short, had Jesus saved himself from the cross, he would have betrayed his own principles, and the Sermon on the Mount would never have had a commentator. Had he not perished, his teachings would have perished. Had he saved himself, his life would have been in vain as reaching no climax in the actual self-renunciation of love, so that quite literally he died in order that he might not die.

Thus on the one hand there is the explanation of persecution, and on the other, of suffering, or what is the same, of love which is atoning and sacrificial because self-sacrificial. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the apostles entered upon the same style of life and doctrine that had paved Christ's way to the cross, and as he was persecuted so were they. In the persons of the apostles the enemies of Christ were still fighting Christ.

This is the best evidence of their orthodoxy, or rather, Christodoxy. There may be minor differences between the teaching, for instance, of Peter and that of John; there may be a "Petrine doctrine," and a "Pauline doctrine," and a "Johannean doctrine," but when we see Peter and John and Paul identified in suffering for Christ, we know that their enemies identified them in their presentation of Christ. So far as "the tendency theory" goes, all these men had a tendency to suffer for Christ; or "the accommodation theory," they all accommodated themselves to their sufferings in a very Christlike way; or "the mythical theory," it is no myth that the rulers and elders and scribes united in hating them as one without attempting to discover microscopical differences of doctrine among them. In the eyes of these enemies of the cross, it was a sufficient condemnation that they preached and healed and won disciples in the name of Jesus, and as in the eyes of their enemies that was their sufficient condemnation, so in the eyes of

all generations of believers it is their sufficient vindication. The Apostle Paul in more than one striking passage appeals to the persecutions he endured as an evidence of his loyalty to Christ, claiming to be not the least of the apostles in that his sufferings were not the least, and affirming that if he should preach circumcision, that is, Mosaism or Judaism, he would no longer suffer; "Then is the offense of the cross ceased." Speculative schoolmen, and dogmatic theologians, unoccupied except in endless wranglings one with another, and in worshiping their own syllogisms, have sought to enforce, each as final, a multitude of dogmas; but the cross itself stands as the symbol of the one creed for which Christ died, and the offense of the cross on the one hand, and the love of it on the other, were the primitive signs of orthodoxy and heterodoxy.

The first persecutions began timidly enough. Late in the evening Peter and John were imprisoned. Next day there gathered together the whole array of the religiously and politically elite of Jerusalem, not to compliment these humble men for having done a great and kindly deed, but in self-stultification to confront them with this preposterous question: "By what power, or by what name, have ye done this?" To ask this question was to go and touch a mountain clothed in thunders and lightnings more terrible than Mount Sinai in the days when "if so much as a beast touched the mountain, he should be stoned or thrust through with a dart." At the

touch there rushed out the lightning and the thunder of apostolic, Pentecostal speech. "By the name of Jesus of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand before you whole. This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." "Unlearned and ignorant men!" they observed superciliously of them. They marveled nevertheless, and made one other observation not so gratifying, namely, that these "unlearned and ignorant men" had been with Jesus. (See Comments, Ch. iv. 13). And one other thing happened that was not comforting; the man who was healed *stood* there, their well-known beggar-brother, who had always heretofore contented himself with sitting humbly in their presence, pleading for alms. They were nonplused. They must get this man and the two tongues of fire out of sight before they could say another word. Then they communed and said, "A notable miracle has been done, and we cannot deny it." As much as to say, We would deny it if we could; we would lie about it if we could make a lie go. They must find a way out of it, however, and this time they touched more timidly their mountain of terrors. They called the apostles, and commanded them not to preach in the name of Jesus! and threatened them! and— let them go! And this

was the stroke they got for their pains: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard."

Evidently the authorities made a mistake in trying to question these men. After all, the only way to confront Christ is with hammer and nails; or the thirteenth century Roman Catholic way, shouting, "Kill! kill! the Lord will know his own;" or Abdul Hamid's modern way, with sword and gun, stabbing and shooting at leisure, and *ad libitum*. Only in such ways can Christ and his apostolic followers be answered without chagrin. And such ways are not finally effective, for the dead Christ rises, and the Christian martyr only begins to preach when his martyrdom is complete.

Upon their release the apostles went to their own company, grown to thousands now, and united with them in a sublime chorus of praise, ending with the prayer, "And now, Lord, behold their threatenings; and grant unto thy servants that with all boldness they may speak thy word, by stretching forth thy hand to heal; and that signs and wonders may be done in the name of thy holy Child Jesus." And the Lord answered them with an earthquake, and with a renewed enduement of the Holy Spirit.

Human threatenings and divine encouragements! The apostles became giants, heroic and impetuous. They preached and healed in Solomon's porch (v. 12), and multitudes of believers were added to

the Lord, and the sick were brought from surrounding cities, and the very shadow of Peter passing by was potent to heal. The summary judgment upon the first deceivers, Ananias and Sapphira, must have contributed to the dread of the situation on the part of the authorities, but at last their rage overmastered their prudence, and they threw the apostles into prison (v. 18). The next morning the high priest and the sect of the Sadducees called the council together, and enacted the following comedy. They sat in state, a semi-circular row of grey beards, "tall, good-looking, wealthy, learned (both in divine law and divers branches of profane science, such as medicine, mathematics, astronomy, magic, idolatry, etc.), in order that they might be able to judge in these matters;" they sat thus, waiting, anxious to judge the "ignorant and unlearned" men who had been with Jesus. These men, not destined to stay in prison that night, were at their appointed business, teaching and healing in the temple courts. Officers called for them at the prison, but it was the wrong place. Doubt grew to astonishment with the double report of their absence from the prison, and their presence in the temple. They were brought, however, "without violence," and the high priest passed upon them, unintentionally, this high compliment: "Did not we straightly command you that you should not teach in that name? And behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us." And the quick

retort,—"We ought to obey God rather than men. The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, to give repentance to Israel, and the forgiveness of sins. And we are witnesses of these things; and so is the Holy Spirit, whom God hath given to them that obey him."

This is the model martyr speech. Heroism can go no higher. Paul, and Justin Martyr, and Savonarola, and Martin Luther, and John Huss, and Cranmer, and Ridley, and Latimer, and John Knox, fronting their respective Sanhedrins, popes and Bloody Marys, are worthy of places in the same class with the Apostle Peter, he standing first among them in daring speech and deed for Christ, this being his true and only primacy.

There are two effects from being "cut to the heart," one the Pentecost effect, the other the effect upon the "tall, good-looking, learned" members of the Sanhedrin. Murder was their staple argument against truth. They had murdered Jesus, they were now intent upon murdering the apostles. But the prudent counsels of Gamaliel prevailed. Perhaps they remembered Ananias and Sapphira; perhaps, the escape of the prisoners; perhaps, the miracle of tongues; perhaps, the darkness and earthquake and rending of the temple veil; perhaps, the resurrection of Jesus. "Tall, good-looking, wealthy" misleaders of the land, cowed, conscienceless, squirming, with

no reason but prejudice, and no mercy but cowardice, on the verge of perdition, and dragging their nation at their heels like a hound in the leash,— that is what the Sanhedrin had grown to be. In its helplessness and its fury and its emptiness of everything good, lifting its heel only to kick against the goads, and in its blindness crashing

> "Up against the thick-bossed shield
> Of God's judgment in the field,"

it is the type of all truckling senates, and cowardly congresses, and time-serving, partisan parliaments.

"These first persecutions stimulated the zeal and enthusiasm of the first disciples, and braced them for the struggle (iv. 24; v. 41). 'It is better to obey God than man.' In this phrase we hear by anticipation the farewell of the apostles to national Judaism. So, little by little, Christianity and Judaism came to exhibit the hostility latent in their principles. Let a man now arise bold enough to disentangle the two systems and set them in antithesis, and we shall see the great conflict begun by the discourses and the death of Jesus break forth again as freely as before. Such a man was Stephen, deacon and martyr."

In this paragraph, full of discernment, quoted from Sabatier, there are indicated the source and the direction of Jewish persecution against the growing church.

IV.
THE FIRST MARTYR

"My Lord died for my sins· shall I not gladly give this poor life for him?"—*Savonarola.*

"When the cap painted over with devils, and inscribed 'Heresiarch' was put on his brow, he murmured, 'My Lord Jesus wore for my sake a crown of thorns; shall I not wear this lighter disgrace for the sake of him? I will, indeed, and that right gladly.'" —*John Huss.*

"Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man! We shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out."—*Latimer.*

"Father, forgive them; they know not what they do."—*Luke xxiii. 34.*

IV.

THE FIRST MARTYR.

"And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this he fell asleep."—*Acts vii. 59, 60.*

THE martyrdom of Stephen marks an epoch in the history of the first church. That two or three years should have passed away before the first blood was shed is noteworthy. The shadow of the crucifixion still rested upon the guilty nation, and the boldness of the apostles was their best protection. At last the storm broke, and in its fury there was a demand for blood. In the growth of the church, in the apostles' unanswerable logic of word and deed, in the appearance of new men of mark, such as Stephen, resistless in the spirit and wisdom of his advocacy, there was enough to convert the "children of wisdom;" enough to enrage unto ruin typical Pharisees and Sadducees. Through the church composed of regenerate men, and crowned with miracles of speech and deed, the Holy Spirit became the savor of life unto life, and of death unto death.

The first martyr was a member of the first committee. There was a growing church with its growing community of goods, and the burden of their

distribution became too great for the apostles. Besides, the Grecians were murmuring that their widows were neglected in the daily ministration. True Christian policy dictated that Grecians should be appointed to answer the complaints of Grecians. In democratic style, therefore, the people were permitted to choose seven men from among themselves for this daily diaconate. Whom the people chose the apostles appointed. Here is democracy with the sanction of aristocracy. Where the Holy Spirit guides government is a minor matter, for over the democracy of the people and the wise aristocracy of the apostles rises the autocracy of the Spirit himself.

These seven men are never called deacons. Their appointment was simply a question of the proper division of labor, the apostles becoming thereby more especially and fittingly deacons of the word, and the chosen seven especially and fittingly deacons of the "tables," or counters. They were all deacons, servants, ministers, but each in his own place; it was all the Lord's work, and they were brethren; there was no clerical caste. The distinctive offices of the diaconate and the bishopric arose at a later date, and seem never within the limits of the New Testament literature to have been absolutely fixed, for men called themselves deacons, or overseers, or presbyters according to what they were doing at the time. Even the first seven are not rigidly fixed to the diaconate of tables. It was not long till two of them at least became deacons of the word; Philip preached

in Samaria, and became the evangelist and baptist of the Ethiopian officer; and Stephen attained to the diaconate of wonders and miracles and irresistible speech,—of martydom even!

To infer, therefore, that the appointment of the seven is a precedent for the ordaining of deacons such as are now found in various congregations of Christians is unwarranted. The whole procedure is rather a precedent for the appointment of a committee to meet an emergency. Is there a needful thing to be done? Appoint a proper person, or company of persons, to do it. That is the double dictate of common prudence and of the Holy Spirit.

Carrying out the supposition previously made that the Jews of Jerusalem were overawed by the scenes of the crucifixion and of Pentecost, it is interesting to note that the murder of the first martyr was wrought at the instigation of foreign Jews, or possibly even of proselytes. "There arose certain of the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia, and of Asia, disputing with Stephen." There were numbers of synagogues in Jerusalem, the meeting-places respectively of such foreign Jews as are named in the text. Equally zealous with the Jerusalem Jews for "the holy place," and "the law," and "the customs which Moses delivered," they had not yet experienced the terrors of opposing Christ and his apostles. The dread of the name of the Nazarene had not yet settled down upon them. They were fresh in

the work of persecution, and to them Satan transferred it. The whole of the chosen people, native born to Judæa and foreign born, seemed fated to stain their hands in the blood of Jesus and the protomartyrs.

The charge against Stephen is a compliment to him. It is an evidence of his discernment. Already he saw further than the apostles themselves into the genius of the Gospel and the destinies of the nation. There was antagonism between the Gospel and the law of Moses at many points, and if Christianity triumphed Judaism must suffer defeat. The new wine could not be put into old bottles. The apostles were true to Christ and the leadings of the Holy Spirit, but they were also traditionalists, and as such they still "went up into the temple at the hour of prayer to worship," and were doubtful about admitting the Gentiles into the church except on a Jewish basis, and perhaps, loving both the old and the new, fondly hoped for some providential reconciliation between the new cloth and the old garment. But the enemies of the cross, hating it, saw its tendencies more clearly through their hatred than the apostles through their love. Evidently Stephen saw precisely what his persecutors saw, namely, that there was no possible reconciliation between the spirit of the Jews and the spirit of Jesus; between his liberty and their bigotry; between his mercy and their cruelty, his love and their hatred, his culture and their cult. Stephen and his enemies, therefore, occupy the same

standpoint as to their prevision of results should Christianity triumph. He and they differ only in attitude, and the difference is deadly.

The falsity of their evidence against him consists in this, that they attributed to him as blasphemy what he was preaching, either implicitly or explicitly, as inevitable from the standpoint of Gospel truth. He was accused of a double blasphemy, first against "the holy place," and second, against "the law" (vi. 13). His speech is an admirable answer to this accusation, and should be studied wholly in view of it. It is biblical, and it is a rhetorical model. It rushes on like a stream, swollen and impassioned. It is historical, but not accurately so. Some of its statements are not in keeping with the records, as, for instance, when it is said that Abraham bought the burying ground in Sychem of the sons of Emmor, whereas it was Jacob who made this purchase, Abraham having bought the cave of Machpelah from Ephron the Hittite. (See Comments.) Twice the Septuagint is quoted rather than our present Hebrew text, and Moses is declared "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," though the Old Testament is silent as to that, as it is likewise with regard to his "trembling" at the burning bush. It is an inspired speech, all but its jots and tittles. Something may be chargeable to the reporter, and besides, mere technical inspiration is no inspiration at all. We must get away from that if we would entertain the Bible's own view of its own inspiration. The quota-

tions of Jesus are not always verbatim, but they are none the less divine. On great moral questions, such as the abolition of slavery, or the prohibition of the liquor traffic, we may not have a single text to bring face to face with our problem in such a way as to make it say, "Thou shalt not enslave thy brother," or "Thou shalt not sell wine and beer," yet we may feel that we have the whole Bible on our side, saying, with all the lightnings and thunderings of its Mosaic inspiration, and with all the blood-marked emphasis of its Gospel revelations, "Thou shalt not." It is the soul of the Bible that is inspired, and its body is the best that can be given to it in human speech.

The inaccuracies of the speech are evidences of its genuineness. A second century writer, at leisure in his study, with a method by the end, would have taken pains to be verbally exact. As the speech stands, it bears every mark of having been delivered to such an audience as the Jewish Sanhedrin in the early history of the first church, and the view-point of it is worthy of the forerunner of the Apostle Paul. True at once to the trend of Jewish history and to the genius of the Gospel, full of impetuosity and of sudden adaptations to the mood of the hearers, bristling with indirect reproofs of the localized idea of God and his providence, and containing, in the language of Moses himself, one crowning rebuke of their rejection of Jesus—it is no wonder that this

sermon had the effect of a fire-brand upon the already overheated tempers of its auditors.

The early part of the speech, down to the thirty-fifth verse, is fitted to chain the attention of the Sanhedrin, and to prove that Stephen held in reverence the history of his people and the law of Moses. He had been charged with blasphemy; here all is reverent. But with the thirty-fifth verse there begins an application of history that is keener than a two-edged sword. Moses, whom God had chosen, through whom he showed wonders in the wilderness for forty years, and through whom he spoke on Mount Sinai, their fathers had rejected; they made a calf and worshiped it, and turned back in their hearts to Egypt, and took up the tabernacle of Moloch. It was terrible to remind the proud members of the Jewish council of their nation's historic rejection of Moses, and the idolatries of their fathers; it was still more terrible to remind them of a prediction that this divinely accepted, humanly rejected Moses had made, namely, that God would raise up unto them of their brethren a prophet like unto himself, whom in all things they should hear, and to apply this prediction to Jesus, and to say to them, "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit: as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murder-

ers: Who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it."

The Christological standpoint of this proto-martyr is the same as that of the Apostle Peter on the day of Pentecost, and his boldness in denouncing the leaders of the land as the murderers of Jesus parallels that of the chiefest apostles. This application of history and denunciation of the death of the Savior at their hands, cut like a saw to the hearts of men who once had cried, in thoughtless, heartless rage, "His blood be on us, and on our children."

The inspiration of Stephen at this moment carried him beyond the range of daring and triumphant speech. Full of the Holy Spirit, he "looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God." Granted thus at the same moment a Theophany and a Christophany, he cried out, saying, "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." This should have overawed his enemies, and turned them from their bitterness, for if before he began his speech they that looked upon him "saw his face as it had been the face of an angel," what must have been its rapture in this moment of ecstatic vision! But a height of perversity, second only, as it would seem, to that which mocked the dying Savior, was revealed in them when they cried out, and stopped their ears, and rushed upon him, and cast him out of the city and stoned him.

The style of his dying was Christlike. If men were not able to resist the wisdom and power of his speaking, how could they resist the Christliness of his dying! There is an eloquence of action mightier than the eloquence of diction. But when human speech has assumed its highest form in prayer and forgiveness, and when prayer and forgiveness and trust are sealed unto eternal glory by calm and sweet and heroic dying, the plea to man by man thus made is irresistible, except by those whose hearts are stone. They stopped their ears, they rushed upon him, and the stones with which they crushed him were not so hard as the hearts with which they hated him. And these were the hearts that Jesus saw, harder than stone, flintier than the rock, more cruel than death, full of prejudice, big with hatred, and alive and throbbing only with murder, when he gave utterance to his parables of judgment, and his terrible simile of whited sepulchers and dead men's bones, and his awful philippic against Pharisaic hypocrites, fated to the condemnation of hell; ah! these were the hearts he saw when he mourned over Jerusalem and foretold her destruction. Had hell been discoverable no otherwhere in the universe, Jesus would have looked into these hearts and found it there. Full of the conceptions of hatred, and pregnant with bloodshed, it was from these hearts that there came forth in the days of the siege of their "holy place" internal discord, high-handed revenge, secret assassination, public brawls, street

fights, multiplied murders, and all the untold woes of fanatical rapine, which, together with the siege, have made the name of their city as significant of cursing and doom, on the one hand, as it is of peace and "an eternal weight of glory," on the other.

The death of Stephen had not even the mock but finished forms of law for its sanction, as in the case of Jesus. The members of the council, whose business it was to protect life; whose maxim was, "The Sanhedrin is to save, not to destroy life;" whose president at the beginning of the trial "solemnly admonished the witnesses, pointing out the preciousness of human life, earnestly beseeching them carefully and calmly to reflect whether they had not overlooked some circumstance which might favor the innocence of the accused;"—the members of this august council, composed of "middle-aged men, tall, good-looking, wealthy, learned—none of them very old persons, nor eunuchs, nor proselytes, nor nethinim," failed to render a decision at all. According to custom, they should have waited till the next day before pronouncing Stephen guilty. But they lost their gravity, and stopped their ears, and howled, and rushed upon their victim, and the Sanhedrin became a mob.

They should have credit for quick work. The refinements of persecution were not yet invented. They did not cut off his ears, or slit his nose, or brand him with hot irons, or stretch him on racks, or hang him with a strappado, or blow him up to burst-

ing with a bellows, or roast him at a slow fire, or crown him as heresiarch with painted devils on his cap. In a way blunt, and straightforward enough, they crushed him with stones. The above more deliberate and scientific and satisfactory ways of defending the faith, and reclaiming heretics, and propagating the Gospel, were left to the sanctified, inventive genius of Roman Catholicism. In such ways the "Holy Father Infallible," and "The Holy Mother Church," have shown the world how to chastise their children out of paternal love for them, and with tender solicitation for their spiritual welfare. With such beneficent chastisements the "Holy Mother" has murdered—the astonishing estimate is—fifty millions of her children!

But back of all persecution, and more astonishing than it, and sadder, lies the utter misconception of the genius of the Gospel and the method of Jesus. From the standpoint of Christ's commission the heresiarch is he who does not go and teach and preach and baptize in the name and the spirit of Christ; and from the standpoint of the cross the heresiarch is he who sins against the law of love. Under Christ we have no weapons but truth and love and forbearance and forgiveness; guided by him we have no appeal but to the minds and hearts and consciences of beings like-minded and like-hearted with ourselves, and conscience-crowned as well as we. Education was the method of Jesus. His society is a teaching brotherhood. To him the miter

and the crown were equally repugnant. He disdained the sword, and healed its wounds. His death is the seal upon his life of a true teacher's limitless love, and his resurrection is proof of a perfect teacher's rightful regnancy. He is not persecutor, and therefore destroyer, but he is educator, and therefore Redeemer. Master of masters in moral and spiritual realms he cries to his followers with the emphasis of pierced hands and thorn-marked brow, "Go teach." His misrepresentatives, enthroned, crowned, sceptered, mitered in Cæsar's fashion, have spoken their anathemas and their excommunications with threatenings of hell and the horrors of the battlefield, and out of hearts full of the hatred from which murder springs, they have cried, "Go kill."

Seven times on the cross Jesus opened his lips, and there continued to speak as never man spake. Two of his matchless utterances find close resemblance in the words of his dying disciple: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do;" "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Oh, the heights and depths of Christ's manward love and forgiveness, and of his Godward love and trust! Heights and depths measured, yet measureless by these last prayers of his passion! We in our days of delight, repeating our easy and customary forms of prayer, attain too often only to the semblance of love and forgiveness and trust. But he who through days of distress, or amidst a storm of crushing, mangling stones prays thus for his enemies and himself has

attained to the reality of discipleship in the school of Christ. The first martyr claimed by right of Christly dying, Christly glory.

"And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this he fell asleep."

CARL A. RUDISILL LIBRARY
LENOIR RHYNE COLLEGE

V.

THE FIRST GENTILE CONVERT

"Calvary made an irrevocable breach between the religion of the past and of the future. Jesus, in dying, guaranteed his work against any unintelligent or timid reaction. From the outset he planted his cross between Christianity and Judaism; and so often as his disciples are tempted to retrace their steps, they find it placed as an impassable barrier between them and their nation. The cross, in fact, was the real motive principle of all the progress which ensued; it was this which gave impulse and impetus to the primitive church, and drove it irresistibly beyond the limits of Judaism."—*Sabatier.*

V.

THE FIRST GENTILE CONVERT.

"Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them."—*Acts xi. 3.*

"God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean."—*Acts x. 28.*

THE conversion of Cornelius and his household equals in its progressive significance the miracle of Pentecost. Once more the Apostle Peter, endued with the Holy Spirit, stands in the forefront of the evangelistic movement. The keys of the kingdom are in this man's keeping, and it his province to go forward opening doors of prophecy, and of liberty, and of salvation till the Gentiles come to Christ's light, and their kings to the brightness of his glory.

On the day of Pentecost the Church of Christ was born; on the day of the conversion of Cornelius she reached her majority. From that time she was ready to go forth "conquering and to conquer." On that day she cast aside the leading strings of Judaism, and declared herself equipped for heavenly ministries among the Gentile races of all the world. In the conversion of Cornelius the young church gave the challenge of her spirituality and universality to decadent Judaism and the cramped and cramping forms of the Mosaic ritual. Through the lips of her

chosen first apostle, moving still under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, she asserted her heavenly queenliness, and published at the same time the platform of her world-wide regnancy, saying, "God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him."

"All zones are one seed-field,
And one the fostering sky;
Best germs the ripened ages yield
On world-wide pinions fly.

"High human hearts are one,
And one their God above;
And genial every star and sun
To faith and hope and love."

Perhaps a period of ten years lies between the conversions of Pentecost and the conversion of Cornelius, but in the plans of the Savior these two acts belong to the same drama. The full obedience of the commission requires them both as the inception of Christ's world-wide kingdom. The second chapter of the book of Acts is not complete without the tenth, and the two rise up from among the others in a kind of lonely majesty. In both there is the presence of the Apostle Peter; in both the Holy Spirit speaks miraculously; in both Jesus is presented as the crucified and risen Lord and Christ; in both there is the offer of the remission of sins through the acceptance of Jesus as Savior; in both there breathes the spirit of prayer wherein souls are seek-

ing a higher life, and the culmination of both is in the joy of conversion.

Yet these two chapters differ by the breadth of whole horizons. The first of them speaks to us of the inception of Christ's kingdom; the second, of its extension; if the first means birth, the second means breadth; if the first indicates a center, the second is a circumference; if the first shows us a divinely commanded "beginning at Jerusalem," the second enters upon the divinely prescribed "uttermost parts of the earth." It was a new day in philosophy when the law of gravitation, applying to an apple, was seen also in its application to the solar system and the constellations. Likewise it was a new day in the church when the Jerusalem Christians were constrained by the account that the Apostle Peter gave them of the conversion of Cornelius to "hold their peace, and glorify God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life."

Cornelius was a Gentile, and without becoming a Jew he became a Christian. That is the point of most significance in our present study. On the highway leading from Jerusalem to Gaza Philip had preached to the Ethiopian officer, and close by the road, in a lake of water lying in the Wady el-Hasy, according to the suggestion of Edersheim, he had baptized him. But this man was a proselyte, and he had been to Jerusalem to worship, and there was therefore nothing irregular about his reception into the church. Furthermore, both Philip and Peter had preached

among the Samaritans, and many of them had been brought to Christ, and churches had been established among them, as shown by the enumeration in the thirty-first verse of the ninth chapter of Acts. The Samaritans, however, were semi-Jews, and they were a circumcised people. But the conversion of Cornelius and his household was unique. He and his were publicly and avowedly Gentiles; they had never been either to Gerizim or to Jerusalem to worship; they gave no attendance at the altar; they had no part or lot or pride in the lineage of Abraham; they were Gentiles, pagans, dogs, Romans. To receive them into the fellowship of the church without submission to the requirements of the Mosaic law meant the abrogation of that law, and this to the Jew meant the height of treason. The Jews charged Stephen with saying that Jesus of Nazareth would destroy their Holy Place, and change the customs that Moses had delivered to them, and upon that charge they stoned him to death. In the conversion of Cornelius, therefore, there were the beginnings of revolution, possibly of disaster to the young church, certainly of those misunderstandings and explanations and persecutions and alienations which are the birth-pains of liberty, and the growing-pains of progress.

From one view-point it seems like an enigma of Providence that such a fruitful cause of dissension should have been introduced so early into the church, and that the Jewish and Gentile Christians should, within twenty years of Christ's crucifixion, stand

fronting each other in determined antagonism. But victory is the fruit of battle, and the way of peace is necessarily the way of the sword. It was in this sense that the Prince of Peace said, "I come to bring a sword on the earth." The Gospel, universal in its genius, must become universal in its methods, and in doing so it must break away from the barriers of carnalism and formalism and localism and tribalism. Jerusalem could never be the religious capital of the world; the Jewish altar, smoking with the blood of rams, could never give to the world the sweet assurance of the remission of sins; the Jewish Sabbath, burdened with numberless slavish and superstitious precepts of Rabbinism, could never convey to the world the joy, the freedom, and the inspiration of the Lord's Day, bearing with it round the globe once weekly the eucharistic reminders of the Lord's death; the negative precepts uttered by the thunders of Sinai could never rise to the divine altruism of the Golden Rule; nor could the feasts and fasts and tithings and sprinklings of a mere ethnic cult ever become of world-wide, spiritual concern. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." One thing or the other: the new movement must settle down within the narrow dimensions of the old, or it must break away like a growing child from his cast-off garments. "Moses for a people; Christ for the world." Looking back upon all the dreadful history that came upon the Jews during the generation that saw Jesus

perish on the cross, one must see that had the new movement confined itself to the limits of Judaism it must inevitably have been buried, like a child in the grave of its mother. The salvation of the movement was in its enlargement. The historic necessities were that the Church of Christ should extend her offer of salvation to all the world, or be herself condemned to destruction. She must seek to save the nations if she would be saved by them. The time had come when the apostles of the cross must go boldly to Cornelius, looking out from his fortress in Cæsarea upon the waters of the Mediterranean; to Lydia, praying upon the banks of the Gangites; to the jailer in Philippi, amidst his granite walls and iron bars, and say to each and all of them, "These fortresses and river banks and prison walls are as holy as the Holy of Holies when here, through Christ, you present your bodies as living sacrifices unto God, esteeming such sacrifice reasonable service." The Holy Spirit saw fit to make Cornelius the occasion of such enlargement, and the first fruits of it, and the Apostle Peter the instrument of it.

That we may appreciate these two men in their meeting and their mutual relations, we must first study them apart, remembering that each, on his pathway to find the other, was under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. God had these men in training for their meeting. As typical Jew and typical Gentile, yet prepared, the one for the declaration, the other for the reception of the Gospel, they meet;

and thereafter they stand before the world, not as representatives of the deplorable schisms and hatreds among men, but as types together, mutual and fraternal, of the "new man in Christ."

The Jews esteemed it their religious and political duty to hate the Gentiles. From the days of Abraham their theory and their practice had united in making them an exclusive people, and from the days of the captivity in Babylon they were a fanatical people, hating all not Jews, and courting their hatred. By the rivers of Babylon they dreamed and sang of revenge, but never of forgiveness, saying with awful imprecation, "O daughter of Babylon, who art to be destroyed, happy shall he be that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us! Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones!"

There was a tradition that at Mount Sinai the Jews were cleansed from the impurities that cling to mankind by reason of the relations between Eve and the serpent, and which still cling to all the rest of mankind. They said God cares more for one Israelite than for all the rest of the world. Gentile babes were unclean from their birth. The Mishna forbids aid to a Gentile mother in her hour of need, or the giving of nourishment to her new-born babe, lest a child should be brought up for idolatry. One maxim reached the height of scowling hatred: "The best among the Gentiles, kill; the best among serpents, crush its head."

Chosen of God as a medium and a means to a

beneficent end, they mistook themselves as being the beginning and the end of God's purposes, and concluding that he had cast off all other people, they settled down into the rankest of Pharisaical self-complacency, and from the standpoint both of their hatred and their exclusiveness, they interpreted their prophecies concerning the promised Messiah. During the generation of which we are speaking, the Romans were their special objects of hatred because they were the political lords of the land, and were looked upon as being the despoilers of the glory of Israel. Hating Rome worse than sin, and Cæsar worse than Satan, they naturally planned for a Messiah who should be a prince, and a soldier, and a political redeemer. How absolutely were they disappointed in Christ! He rebuked their hatred while he healed their sick ones, refused their proffered crowns while he fed their multitudes, and preached forgiveness while he paid tribute to Cæsar, till at last they said, "If we let him thus alone, the Romans will come and take away our place and nation."

Now the Apostle Peter was a true Jew, born and bred with all the inherited and inculcated antipathies of his race. Hence his rebuke of Jesus, as recorded in the sixteenth chapter of Matthew, and his mournful but inevitable denial, as recorded in the twenty-sixth chapter. Hence also his pathetic and patriotic question at the ascension of Jesus: "Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to *Israel?*" Up to the time of Pentecost this man had had line

upon line, precept upon precept; yet there was required a miracle of spiritual guidance lest he should speak amiss, and launch forth upon a crusade against the Gentile enemies of his people and nation instead of proclaiming the spiritual triumphs and heavenly promises of the true Messiah. But the heights of heavenly-directed speech attained by this apostle on Pentecost are to be surpassed, should he still submit to that Spirit which was guiding him into all truth.

When Cornelius sent for Peter, he was "lodged in the house of one Simon, a tanner, whose house was by the seaside." With this tanner he had lodged many days, unconscious that this was a preparation for his further departure from old prejudices, and for the braving of uncleannesses. Tanners were esteemed unclean. This man's house was by the seaside, possibly for convenience, but certainly because he was not permitted to live in the town of Joppa. The rabbis said, "It is impossible that the world can do without tanners, but woe unto that man who is a tanner!" They released a widow from the law requiring her to marry her deceased husband's brother, if that brother happened to be a tanner. "He is lodged in the house of one Simon, a tanner." It needed no other description; everybody knew where that house was, for everybody was accustomed to shun it. And that Peter, the primate of the apostles, should bear the stigma of such lodgings, shows that he had not been under the tuition of Jesus in

vain. However, there must be another revelation before he is ready for his very largest work; and still, in the face of that revelation, he will cry out, after his old style, "Not so, Lord!" throwing, as was his wont, his corrections into the face of Christ's revelations. "Not so, Lord! for nothing common or unclean hath at any time entered into my mouth." True Jew! True disciple! Denying and converted! Correcting and corrected! Noble! Abased! Shrinking! Daring! Impulsively resisting, yet considerately following, the guidance of the Holy Spirit! We are inclined to tears, and we are forced to admiration, while we rank him among the greatest and truest of our human brothers and leaders.

Imperatively the voice from the vision answered, "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common or unclean." The echoes of this imperative voice were still sounding through his soul, while another voice was calling at the gate, and saying, "Is Simon, whose surname is Peter, lodged here?" God's plans had come together as hand locks hand, and on the morrow Peter went with them, "doubting nothing."

It would be hard to find a nobler representative than Cornelius in the person of whom the Gentile world might lay claim to the blessings of the Father's new kingdom. He is a worthy leader of the Gentile hosts, who through faith in Christ have "subdued kingdoms and wrought righteousness." None of the centurions who are mentioned in the New Testament

are ignoble, and Cornelius stands foremost among them. His character is sketched in four words: he is devout, God-fearing, charitable, prayerful. But this bold outline gains immensely in vividness when we look beyond to the awful background on which it is drawn. From the thousands of gods in the Roman Pantheon, representatives of the vanities, lusts, cruelties, and idolatries of all the world, this man turned to the worship of Jehovah, gathering as he could from the Jews around him accurate notions of the supreme and holy Deity. In the midst of a nation thronged with millions of human chattels he made his servants members of his praying household. Living among a vindictive and hateful people his hand was open to them with alms; and though he might naturally have been superciliously proud of his Roman name and lineage, he is nevertheless so humble as to send for spiritual guidance to a Jew lodged with a tanner.

At last these two Spirit-led, chosen men, meet. It is a scene for an artist. The Roman soldier, clad in breast-plate and helmet, falls down to worship at the feet of the fisherman Jew. The Jew, no longer thinking of Gentile pollution, lifts him up, saying: "Stand up; I myself also am a man." And so side by side they walk, entering into the house, mutually explaining all that their visions had not explained, the soldier of the cross and the soldier of the sword, brothers already potentially, their hearts swelling with mutual love under the inspiration of hopes

reaching heaven-high and world-wide. This talking and walking with the centurion, and entering into his house is the beginning of the sublime pageantry of Christ's international, blood-bought, Spirit-born, brotherhood.

The apostle began his sermon before the centurion and his household by the frank statement of the last revelation that he was ever to receive. His first great revelation was that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God. Of this he was finally convinced by the resurrection of Jesus. His second great revelation was the plan of salvation as announced to the inquiring believers on the day of Pentecost: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." His third great revelation he announces in these words: "I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." In this he reached the summit of the mountain up which he had been traveling, and stumbling, from the day that the Savior called him to leave his boats and nets. Higher in the ways of revelation it is not possible to go. The Apostle Paul knew a certain one caught up into the third heaven, but what he saw there it was unlawful to tell in this world.

Aside from this final revelation, standing as an introduction, the apostle's sermon is the same that he preached on the day of Pentecost, modified only

in minor details to meet the needs of the occasion. While he was declaring the resurrection of Jesus, and his reigning and judicial authority, and the remission of sins through faith in him, the Holy Spirit fell upon the hearers precisely as upon the apostles and others on the day of Pentecost. This was at once the Savior's sign of acceptance as regarded the Gentiles, and his seal of approval as regarded the apostle's preaching to them. Immediately it enabled the Apostle Peter to challenge the adverse opinion of his Jewish brethen, the six who had accompanied him, as to the acceptance of the Gentiles, and afterward, as recorded in the eleventh chapter, to offer to the Jerusalem church such a defense of his course as could not be gainsaid. Here is the challenge: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?" Breaking the silence that followed, "he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Evidently the apostle places baptism here as the culmination of conversion. It was the last step of the pathway that Cornelius traveled entering the church. If the six Jewish brethren wished to challenge the reception of Cornelius into the church, there at the waters of baptism was the place to do it. There and then they should speak, or forever hold their peace. They dared not demand circumcision, they dared not refuse baptism, and without the former, and upon the basis of the latter, they accepted the fellowship of

the Gentiles, "tarrying certain days" with them, and "eating with them." All this is indicative of the place that baptism held in the economy of the first church, and in the minds of the first Christians.

By the conversion of Cornelius a great mystery was made plain. The Apostle Paul refers to this as a dispensation of the grace of God, and as a revelation, "which," he says, "in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel" (Eph. iii. 5, 6). To the generous souls among the Israelites it must have seemed surpassingly strange that God should cast off the myriads of the nations around them. Isaiah and Jeremiah could understand it only in view of an ultimately extended reception of them. "It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation to the ends of the earth" (Isa. xlix.6). This large-hearted longing of Isaiah, boldly and beautifully expressed, is representative of such Old Testament passages as seem to stand in conflict with the exclusiveness shown in God's choice of Abraham, and the permanence of the Jewish cult and rites, which over and over again are enjoined upon the people forever. There stood the mystery of nations rejected

of God; hated by all but all of the chosen people; yearned over by few; yet with manifold blessings promised to them in the very covenant, which, by the exclusiveness of its carnal ordinances, seemed to cut them off forever. To a people worshiping the letter of their law rather than its spirit; mistaking their own divinely-appointed office as an end within itself; supposing that their ceremonial types and shadows were the eternal substance of spiritual things; mistaking their promised Messiah for a greater Moses to match and over-match the Cæsars; failing to perceive that his fulfillment of the law was the end of it rather than the confirmation of it; schooled by generations of a history mostly mournful to a life and death loyalty to the customs of their fathers,—to such a people it was an inscrutable mystery that the cast-off peoples were ever in any way to be made one with themselves. The estrangement between Jews and Gentiles seemed incurable; their mutual hatred, ineradicable; and the wall between them, impregnable. But lo! Cornelius is converted, and to those who, like the apostles Peter and Paul, have the eyes to see it, the mystery is solved. That conversion was a revelation and a revolution. Therein "old things passed away; all things became new." In the flesh of Jesus there was "abolished the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances," and in him there was made "of twain, one new man." We are to bring this miracle and this mystery face

to face, and we are to gaze upon the former till the latter is no more. Only so can we understand the conflict that was soon to be waged in the first church, for, mournfully enough, the conversion that brought peace to the noble Roman became a storm center in the kingdom of his new-found Master.

In summary: 1st. The tenth chapter of The Acts presents us with a parallel to Pentecost. There is the same preacher, the same supervision of the Holy Spirit, the same presentation of Christ, the same miracle of conversion. Yet there is an advance upon Pentecost.

2d. It presents us with a good man, non-Christian, non-Jew, made a Christian, but not made a Jew.

3d. It presents us, therefore, with a revelation which was a revolution, and with a conversion that unveiled the mystery of ages.

4th. It presents us with the Apostle Peter's path of progress till he reached perfection in revelation.

VI.

THE FIRST GENTILE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

"By revelation he made known unto me the mystery, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel."—*Eph. iii. 3-6.*

"It was from Antioch, and with the co-operation of its church, that Paul undertook his great missionary tours into Asia Minor and Greece."—*Schaff.*

VI.

THE FIRST GENTILE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

"Now they that were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen traveled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to none but unto Jews only. And some of them were men of Cyprus, and Cyrene, which, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Greeks (Revised Version), preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number turned unto the Lord."—*Acts xi. 19-22.*

ANTIOCH was the third city in the Roman empire, Rome being first, and Alexandria second. Eastward it commanded the region lying toward the fertile valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates; northward, Asia Minor and the highways leading thence to Rome; westward, by way of the Orontes, the shores of the Mediterranean. As an evangelistic center, Antioch had points of advantage over any of her sister cities. Babylon was too far to the east to influence the growing western world. Alexandria had Egypt for her background, but the world's progress did not lie in that direction; and, besides, that city was so speculative as to spoil Christianity almost as soon as she had received it. Jerusalem was doomed to destruction by reason of its exclusiveness. Antioch was cosmopolitan. All things considered, it was a strategic point to be gained and held by the Christian faith, and from which to propagate that faith.

Nature had adorned Antioch with the splendor of rivers and the majesty of mountains; commerce had poured her wealth into it, and the Seleucid princes had spared no pains to enrich it with the works of human grandeur and art. Renan, as quoted by Prof. B. A. Hinsdale, in his "Jewish Christian Church," has given the following description of its population:

"It was an inconceivable medley of merry-andrews, quacks, buffoons, magicians, miracle-mongers, sorcerers, priests, impostors; a city of races, games, dances, processions, fetes, debauches, of unbridled luxury, of all the follies of the East, of the most unhealthy superstitions, and of the fanaticisms of the orgy. The great corso which traversed the city was like a theater, where rolled, day after day, the waves of a trifling, light-headed, changeable, insurrection-loving populace—a populace sometimes spirituel, occupied with romps, parodies, squibs, impertinences of all sorts."

But there were solider elements in its make-up as indicated by the presence of its Roman soldiers, and a colony of Jews, of whom Nicolas, the proselyte, was a representative. Cicero speaks of the city as "distinguished by men of learning and the cultivation of the arts." Certainly the dark and trifling side of the picture of its people is relieved by the readiness with which they received Christianity, and the energy with which they propagated it. In the time of Chrysostom, the population was estimated at

200,000, more than half of whom were Christians.

The persecution that followed the death of Stephen had its beneficent side. As the eagle stirs up her young, and tosses them from the nest, compelling them to fly, so by the hand of persecution the children of the "Mother Church" became missionaries, and Phenice received the Gospel, and Cyprus, and Antioch, and doubtless many intervening cities. This missionary work was at the first confined to the Jews only. But the men of Cyprus and Cyrene, "when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jesus." Upon the more liberal-minded Jews, who had been brought up in lands foreign to Judæa, the leaven of the Gospel was having its legitimate effect. Love was allying itself with the fundamental sense of humanity in passing beyond the arbitrary lines of clannishness and nationalism. So when they came to this great city and saw its needs, they no longer refrained, but boldly preached to the Greeks as well as to the Jews. These missionaries seem to have reached by a more natural course the conclusion which, in the case of the Apostle Peter, came by the way of miracle. Had they themselves entertained any doubt as to the correctness of their course, the Lord stood ready to remove it, for "his hand was with them," and a great number turned to him. "By their fruits ye shall know them." When the preaching of the Word brings forth beneficent results in lives renewed, it is not becoming to censure seeming irreg-

ularities in its presentation. As the Lord himself came to the defense of his faithful and aggressive missionaries in Antioch, so he has risen up in defense to-day of his missionaries in India, and China, and Japan, and Africa, and in hundreds of the islands of the sea. From the standpoints merely of the humanity and the ethics involved in missionary enterprises, and the evident transformations of pagan peoples in personal conduct and social customs, the mouths of the cynics should forever be stopped. And when we add to this those spiritual and eternal considerations upon which our Savior placed so much of the emphasis of his life and teachings, it becomes a matter simply of ignorant and heartless impertinence to seek to throw so much as a straw in the way of missionary progress. Let the adverse critics of missions do three things: let them in the first place remember the ancient missions from which have resulted, by the lapse of centuries, the present conditions of civilization in Europe and America,—missions which began precisely here in Antioch, were carried forward by the immortal labors of the Apostle Paul into Asia Minor and Europe, and thence still further extended among the Goths and Saxons and Angles, by such as Ulfilas and Augustine and Columba and Boniface; in the second place, let them ponder the statistical tables of modern missions standing boldly out from an awful background of heathen and idolatrous conditions, where hatred and lust and superstition rankle within, and lechery and

lies and clannishness and infanticide and widow-burning and priestcraft and tribal wars and cannibalism rage without;—let them note the transformations that have passed over such greater islands as Madagascar and Borneo and Sumatra and Celebes and New Zealand, and at least three hundred of the lesser islands of the Pacific Ocean; and the revolution in Japan, the result of Christian influences; and the missionary explorations of Africa, together with the conversion of whole tribes; and the encouraging advances that have been made in China, where the 50,000 native Christians are but an earnest of the millions confidently expected by the most experienced missionaries; and the still greater advances in India, where, at the present rate of increase, another century will see 100,000,000 of native Christians; in short, let them consider the great and beneficent work that has already been accomplished, remembering, meanwhile, that the majestic enterprise of world-wide evangelization has but just begun; and in the third place, let them pray, really, devoutly pray, "Thy kingdom come;"—then there will be an end of unfriendly criticism.

These unnamed and unknown men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who, when they had got as far as Antioch, dared to break away from traditionalism and do an irregular thing, preaching to the "Greeks," are not only the worthy heralds of the Savior, who in the glory of his resurrection state stood up in a more than manlike boldness of originality and sublimity of

conception, commanding them to do this very thing; but they are also the worthy forerunners of Paul and Barnabas and Ulfilas and Augustine and Carey and Morrison and Moffat and Martyn and Livingstone and Zinzendorf, and a great host which no man can number, as nameless here as these men of Cyprus and Cyrene themselves, but not nameless, we know, where the inerrant record of prophets and apostles and heroes and martyrs is kept.

At last the news of this irregularity in Antioch reaches the church in Jerusalem, and again the Lord's plans are seen to meet as hand locks hand. By the conversion of Cornelius, and the Apostle Peter's explanation and defense of his conduct in admitting this Gentile to full fellowship, the Jerusalem church was made ready for the news from Antioch. When the Apostle Peter completed his defense, saying, "What was I that I could withstand God?" they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." It is wonderful how these Jewish Christians were overcoming their abhorrence of the Gentiles. Properly weighed, it would be hard to find a more fraternal and progressive sentiment than this. Here is the expression of a breadth of brotherhood that could have sprung only from the life and teachings of Christ, and that could have been nurtured into ripeness only by the Holy Spirit. By the side of it that high-sounding Americanism, "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," pales into a

mere political shibboleth, for we do not live it as we ought; and the turbulent Frenchmen of the days of the reign of terror, shouting, "Liberty, fraternity and equality!" while they were cutting off one another's heads, have given us, by way of contrast with the action of the Jerusalem church, the most fearful exhibition of the sentiments of liberty and equality, shorn of the love of Jesus and the potency of the Holy Spirit.

Instead, therefore, of condemning the progressive and even revolutionary work of the Antioch missionaries, the Jerusalem church found it in full keeping with the work done at Cæsarea, for which they had already glorified God. Instead of coming upon them as a shock, and creating a revulsion against the Gentiles, the report came rather as "good news from a far country, and as cold water to a thirsty soul." And surely it is competent to suppose that once more they glorified God, and again joined in the wondrous acclaim, "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto salvation."

As to their action, we are not left to speculation; they did a beautiful thing. "They sent forth Barnabas that he should go as far as Antioch." Why Barnabas? Why not James the legalist, the rigid and ascetic Jew? Why not the Apostle Peter himself? No, they send the "Son of Consolation," the large-hearted, liberal-handed exhorter of the church. He is the man who sold his land and gave the price of it to the church; he is the man who introduced

Paul to the church, and vouched for the genuineness of his conversion, and stood by him in his disputes with the Grecians. Why should they send this "Son of Consolation?" Had the Jerusalem church no professional theologian, with a hard and fast system of dogmatics, that she could send? Had she no professional watch-dogs of the faith, no heresy-sniffers, no arch-inquisitors that she could send to Antioch to spy out their irregularities? Where was her Torquemada? Where at the very least was her "Angelical Doctor," with his "Method of Aristotle," and his twenty-three folio volumes of speculative theology? Why not send him to show the young converts of Antioch whether realism or nominalism was the true philosophy, or to show them the difference between the satisfaction to justice that Jesus wrought in his sufferings and the merit of his obedience to the law, "by virtue of which the redeemed are entitled to the rewards of eternity?" O surely they will send some one who can logic-chop the scaffolding of the new temple they are building in Antioch, and see that it is all done the way the grandfathers did it, and "fashion it according to the pattern shown in the Mount!" Surely the Mother Church will see that the Antioch Church is made from her own stereotype plates, and she will demand that there be no innovations, no progress, no liberty, and if things do not go along the chalk-line of legalism she will issue high-sounding documents with damnatory clauses, and grow furious with the thunders of her excommu-

nications! Where were the Pecksniffs of the Jerusalem church, the non-progressives, always suffering from an attack of conscience, the anti-brethren, who would make a test of fellowship of circumcision, or of a music box, or of a syllogism, or of their own deified dogmatism? O thanks to the Mother Church! She had such characters, as we shall find, but she kept them as long as she could in the dark, where they belong. She refused to appoint them to disturb the peace of the young Gentile church. If they will go on such a mission of infernalism they must go self-appointed, as such characters for the most part do.

It is a mission of fellowship, not of censorship; a mission of love, and not of law, that the Mother Church has to perform. And out of her love, not her legalism, she sends her "Son of Consolation," his credentials being that he *was a son of consolation*, a good man, full of the Holy Spirit, and of faith. In addition to the Apostle Paul's panegyric in the thirteenth chapter of I. Corinthians it may be added, Christian love is not blind; she sees; she has common sense; she does not send out a misfit of bigotry upon her fraternal ministries, but she chooses with clearest insight the precisely fitted minister for such offices. When this good man came to Antioch and saw the grace of God, he was glad, and, true to his character and his mission, he exhorted them (he was only an exhorter) that with purpose of heart they should cleave unto the Lord.

In this exhortation Barnabas justifies his mission.

Whatever other religions may demand, the one essential of Christianity is this cleaving to the Lord Christ. Personal loyalty to his personal Lordship is the sum total of his demands upon us, and it is also his graciously extended privilege to us. To cleave to Christ is to cleave to all that is Christly, and that is atonement. The form of our confession, the substance of our creed, and the rule of our lives as Christians is practically this: "O Christ, where thou goest I will go; where thou lodgest I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God, my God." Or this, "I am persuaded that neither life, nor death, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Or this,

"Alone, O Love ineffable!
Thy saving name is given;
To turn aside from thee is hell,
To walk with thee is heaven.

"Apart from thee all gain is loss,
All labor vainly done;
The solemn shadow of thy cross
Is better than the sun.

"Not thine the bigot's partial plea,
Nor thine the zealot's ban;
Thou well canst spare a love to thee
Which ends in hate of man.

"O Lord and Master of us all!
Whate'er our name or sign,
We own thy sway, we hear thy call,
We test our lives by thine."

Under the leadership of this good man the church grew: "Much people was added unto the Lord." Enlargement in one direction called for enlargement in another. This church must have an assistant pastor, or, more properly, above all other pastors it must have one fit to be their leader. "Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus to seek for Saul; and when he had found him he brought him to Antioch. And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church and taught much people." Barnabas knew Paul by companionship with him better than we know him by his epistles, and he chose him for that place as inerrantly as a great general chooses his captains for strategic encounters. As he had introduced Saul to the church in Jerusalem, so now he introduces him to the Antioch church, and here among Gentiles, among Christians mostly Gentile, the young Jewish zealot and rabbi, the Pharisee of Pharisees, the student of Gamaliel, finds the basis of his life work. So surprising are the destinies marked out by God for his chosen workmen! If the church could always have some good Barnabas for its adviser! If Barnabas could always find the Paul suitable for the place! If Paul and Barnabas could always content themselves to be teaching much people, and not seek to be "lording it over God's heritage!" If the church were always willing to be thus taught and shepherded! — how much foolish and unlearned talk might be spared about "the eldership," and "the

ruling elders," and "the deacons," and "the bishops," and "the presbyters," and their respective functions and official dignities! Up to this point we have heard nothing about the bishops and deacons of the church in Antioch. Possibly they were there, possibly not. Of one thing, however, we may be sure: where Paul and Barnabas were, and such "prophets and teachers" as were associated with them (xiii. 1), the teaching function eclipsed all else. Always in the church the maximum of intelligence means the minimum of surveillance; the maximum of love, the minimum of law; and the maximum of fraternity, the minimum of machinery.

"And it came to pass . . . that the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." At last it began to dawn upon the world that here was a distinct people, neither Jews nor Gentiles. In Jerusalem they seemed to be merely a sect of the Jews; here in Antioch they attained to distinctiveness, and a name for them was inevitable. The world names its genera and species as naturally and necessarily as Adam named the beasts of Eden. The naming of the disciples, therefore, indicates progress; it marks the appearance of a new species; it is one of the milestones of the earliest church history. Is there nothing in names? There is a distinctive movement back of every distinctive name. History makes no mistake in this matter. Let the man who loves the union of Christ's people and yet pleads that his denominational name means nothing, ask history

if, like an insane mother, she has given a name where no really distinct child existed.

With reference to one another, Christ's followers were called brethren; with reference to God, children; with reference to their character, saints; with reference to their Master, disciples; with reference to the Savior, believers; as distinguished from the world by the sum total of their relations to Christ, Christians. None of these names are used in the New Testament as the names of the church, or of any of its congregations. There is no "Brethren Church," or "Children's Church," or "Saints' Church," or "Disciples' Church," or "Christian Church." Taken together, the Christians in the world were designated by pleonasm "the Church of God," or "the Church of Christ," but most simply and most frequently as "the church," there being of course but one; the congregations of Christians were designated always by location, never, never, never by denomination. There were no denominations, and our whole system of isms and their denominational namings is abnormal. There were the churches at Antioch, and Corinth, and Ephesus, and Smyrna, and Laodicea, and Thyatira, but in every case it was simply and sublimely and unmistakably "the church" *there*. It is our denominational environment that is crowding us into such expediencies as "Disciple" with a big D to it, and "The Christian Church" with a big THE before it. At normal, if Christians ever get back to that condition, they will simply say "the

church," and then proceed to give its *place* name rather than its *party* name. There must be denominationalism in denominational names; there may be in the names "Brethren," "Saints," "Disciples," and even "Christian." Sectarianism is first in the spirit and then in the name, and it may be in the spirit in spite of the name, for the very sink of sectarian blasphemy consists in wearing exclusively the name of Christ for the purpose of browbeating all the rest of the world. It is axiomatic that all Christians can unite in Christ, and in the name of Christ, and it is a corollary that there is no other basis of union. Their creed must be the creed of Christ; their name the name of Christ; their spirit the spirit of Christ. No doubt sacrifices must be made of many a dogma, and pet polity, and cherished name, and denominational whim, and the haughty looks of lineage. But then God is able of the stones to raise up seed unto Luther, and Calvin was not crucified for us, nor were we baptized in the name of supralapsarianism. And beyond all else, when we see others casting out devils in Christ's name we must have charity enough not to anathematize them because they follow not with us.

In a double direction "sweet charity" was bridging the chasm between Jew and Gentile. Out of love the church in Jerusalem gave Barnabas to Antioch. But there came forewarnings of a famine, and Judea seems to have been especially afflicted. Out of love the Antioch church, "every man according to his ability, determined to send relief

unto the brethren who dwelt in Judæa. Which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul." Christianity is full of surprises, and this is one of them, that there should have been in such an age, between peoples so sundered by birth and environment, and by every antipathy that can spring from such breeding grounds of hatred as the politics and religions of that day were, such a reciprocity of love. Above there is given Renan's description of the population of Antioch, an unlikely conglomerate of human creatures surely from which to expect a show of substantial charity toward foreigners. But place beside it this paragraph from Mr. Charles Loring Brace's "History of Humane Progress:" "Under the old Greek and Roman habits of mind, the stranger was mainly looked upon as a barbarian and enemy. Something of the same savagery, which in Stanley's travels through Africa made almost every new tribe he met with at once attack him like a dangerous wild beast, animated the ancient races, both barbarous and civilized, in their relations to foreigners. Stoicism indeed cultivated a more humane feeling toward the learned and refined; but the masses of the people in the ancient world were full of prejudices and hostility against those not of their own race or country. It is true that the Roman Empire, with its imperial unity, tended to melt different peoples together under one rule, and strangers and enemies gradually became

only those outside the limits of this grand domain. Toward those, however, the old barbaric feeling and custom were strong as ever. That expression in Plautus, 'A man is a wolf to the man he does not know,' is probably an echo of an old Roman proverb, and utters a common sentiment of the Italian peoples."

Add this further paragraph from the same writer: "The world never needed charity and compassion as it did in the centuries just following Christ. The irresponsible and despotic authority of Rome had stripped some of the richest provinces of the ancient world of every vestige of wealth for the sake of adding to the incredible extravagance and display of the imperial court and city. The system of taxation in distant communities was like that in the states of European Turkey in this century. It soon left nothing to the unfortunate peasants, and mortgaged their harvests years before. Nor did the taxes always reach the imperial exactor. Knavish tax-gatherers, peculating officials, and local rings, plundered the money which was wrung from half-starved farmers. Incessant wars and conquests added to the misery of the laboring classes; and slavery, as we have shown, depressed the industry and wasted the means of the whole empire. Vast masses of proletaires were gathered in the cities, especially in the imperial capital; and poverty, orphanage, abandonment of children, with wide-

spread pauperism prevailed, as they have scarcely ever been known in the history of the world."

Among the systems of philosophy of those times Stoicism is reckoned as the loftiest and most humane; with many it passed for religion as well; but it left its disciples saying actually: "Trouble not thyself; thy neighbor sins, but he sins for himself;" and practically also, trouble not thyself; thy neighbor suffers, but he suffers for himself. Into this world of tribal pride and corresponding scorn; of wars and conquests and slavery and rapacious taxation; of the indifference of the Stoic and the wantonness of the Epicure; into this wolf-like world, three hundred years before it could claim a hospital for the sick or an asylum for the deficient, came the spirit of Jesus, breathing peace and helpfulness. The Greeks had their fabled goddess of Fortune, bearing high her cornu-copia, but Christianity is that goddess in reality. Fortune and plenty spring from love. Regardless of latitude and longitude Christian love pours out her plenty with actual human hands on famine-smitten, and fever-smitten, and plague, war, flood, and storm-smitten spots of earth. And what is more wonderful, over all but infinite desert distances of human alienation she throws her spell of peace and brotherhood. Agabus, the brother prophet, foretold the sufferings of Christian Jews; Christian Greeks immediately responded, sending relief, "every man according to his ability."

The Jerusalem church began with a community of goods; it was her form of sisterly love. The Antioch church began with a collection for foreign sufferers; and that was her form of sisterly love. "Thou," cries St. Augustine, apostrophizing the church, "thou bringest within the bond of mutual love every relationship of kindred, every alliance of affinity; thou unitest citizen to citizen, nation to nation, man to man, not only in society, but in fraternity. Thou teachest kings to seek the welfare of their peoples, and peoples to be subject to kings. . . . Thou showest how to all love is due, and injury to none."*

Sixteen years later the Apostle Paul, meditating upon a similar exhibition of charity by the Gentile churches of Macedonia and Achaia toward "the poor saints that were at Jerusalem," exclaims: "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift."

* *Lux Mundi*, page 420.

VII.

THE FIRST MARTYR APOSTLE

"Then came to him the mother of the sons of Zebedee with her sons, worshiping him, and asking a certain thing of him. And he said unto her, What wouldest thou? And she said unto him, Command that these my two sons may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand in thy kingdom. But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink the cup that I am about to drink? They say unto him, We are able. He saith unto them, My cup indeed ye shall drink; but to sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but it is for them for whom it hath been prepared of my Father."—*Matt. xx. 20-23*

VII.

THE FIRST MARTYR APOSTLE.

"Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword."—*Acts xii. 1, 2.*

James was the first of the apostles to seal his testimony with his life. Perhaps he was prominent in some of the more public functions of the church, sitting thus by the side of Christ, and therefore smitten. Perhaps, being a "Boanerges," he was terribly pronounced in his profession. Perhaps, having been one of the Savior's inner circle of three, he was for that reason more a mark for the enemies of Christ, the greater love entailing the greater danger. But conjectures apart, the fact is he was first, and his death "pleased the Jews."

The death of James is a tragedy responding to a prophecy. The mother of James and John, vanity led, and leading her sons, asked that they might sit, the one on the right hand, and the other on the left, of the Lord in his glory. "Can you drink the cup that I shall drink?" "We can." "You shall indeed." . . . "And he killed James the brother of John with the sword." Thus the Savior's prophecy passes into somber history, and the young man's vanity is forever forgotten in the true man's baptism

of blood. It is ever thus that the Savior, rebuking our magisterial vanities, appoints us to ministerial functions, demanding that we shall come with our lives in our hands, if we would be worthy of places on his right and on his left. There were immensities of differences between the Son of God and these "earthly vessels," yet in the day of trial they proved themselves the worthy repositories of his heavenly treasure. They hazarded their lives, they resisted unto blood, they drank the cup, they have their places at his side.

James is a representative of all the apostles. Not one of them denied Jesus after his resurrection, and to most of them sooner or later Christ's cup of death was presented, and they partook of it "in remembrance of him," a holy eucharist of evidence and love, sealed by blood.

John, own brother to James, lived to a great old age, and though his was not a martyr's death, yet in his tarrying he tasted of deeper bitterness in the persecutions that assailed the church, and the names of Nero and Domitian are sufficient to recall the crowd of mournful metaphors he has left us of the terrible times in which he saw his "little children" perishing under fearful tribulations.

Herod Agrippa I. was the son of Aristobulus, and grandson of Herod the Great. The emperors Caligula and Claudius had restored to him the kingdom of his grandfather, consisting of the tetrarchies of Herod Philip, and Herod Antipas, and Lysanias, and

the provinces of Judæa and Samaria. We may associate and execrate the remembrance of the three Herods as follows: Herod the Great, murderer of babes; Herod Antipas, murderer of the Baptist; Herod Agrippa, murderer of James. Renan calls Agrippa a vile Oriental, and says that, "In return for the lessons of baseness and perfidy he had given at Rome, he obtained for himself Samaria and Judæa, and for his brother Herod the kingdom of Chalcis. He left at Rome the worst memories, and the cruelties of Caligula were attributed in part to his counsels." "The orthodox (Jews) had in him a king after their own heart." His income from rapacious taxation was the equivalent of two million dollars annually. His well nigh absolute and tyrannous power is shown in his oppression of Tyre and Sidon, whose commerce he had impeded if not ruined, and by his favoritism to Beyrout. Evidently, this Herod is one of the monsters of history, "crafty, selfish, extravagant, vainglorious, unprincipled and licentious." In his "Napoléon le Petit," Victor Hugo has the following paragraph, colossal in merited sarcasm:

"History has its tigers. The historians, those immortal keepers of ferocious animals, exhibit to the nations that imperial menagerie. Tacitus has seized and confined eight or ten of these tigers in the iron cages of his style. Behold them! they are frightful and superb; their spots constitute a part of their beauty. This is Nimrod, the hunter of men; that is

Busiris, the tyrant of Egypt; that other is Phalaris, who caused men to be baked alive in a brazen bull, that he might hear the bull bellow; here is Ahasuerus, who tore the scalps from the heads of the seven Maccabees, and caused them to be roasted alive; there is Nero, the burner of Rome, who wrapped the Christians in wax and bitumen, and set them on fire like torches; there is Domitian; here is Caracalla; there is Heliogabalus; that other is Commodus, who has this merit the more in the horror he inspires, that he was the son of Marcus Aurelius; there are the Czars; those, the Sultans; there go the popes,—behold among them the tiger Borgia! see Philip called the Good, as the Furies were called Eumenides; see Richard III., sinister and deformed; behold, with his great face and huge belly, Henry VIII., who, of five wives that he had, murdered three! see Christiern II., the Nero of the North; behold Philip II., the demon of the South! They are frightful; hear them roar; consider them one after the other. The historian brings them out before you; the historian exhibits them, furious and terrible, at the side of the cage, opens for you their jaws, lets you see their teeth, shows you their claws. You can say of every one of them, 'It is a royal tiger.' In truth they have been taken upon their thrones. History leads them forth across the ages. She takes care that they shall not die; they are her tigers."

Victor Hugo neglects to name him, but Herod

Agrippa I. belongs in this cage. In him there were the two requisites for a wholesale persecution of the church. Being a Jew, he hated Christians, and being a king, he had the authority to execute. In the days of Pontius Pilate the Jews were greatly troubled to get Jesus crucified, for there stood the Roman authority precisely in the way of their designs. They could not defy it, and to placate it incurred risk and humiliation. But now they have a superb tool in that trinity of Jew, king, and monster. Perhaps a general persecution was planned, such as that under Nero, or Domitian, or Trajan, or Diocletian; or such as the later persecutions of Protestants by Roman Catholics in France and Germany and Spain and Portugal and Holland, under that most awful and infernal perversion of the religious sentiment known as the Inquisition. The conditions were all present for such an attack. There was the religious intolerance of the Jews, which, like a smouldering flame, had been held in check for thirteen years, or possibly fourteen, counting from the day of Pentecost; the religious and the political functions of the state were in accord for the first time since the birth of Jesus, and the king cared to make himself popular with the multitude at the expense of a despised sect. If such was the plan, and if the apostles James and Peter were intended to be but the first sufferers in a general destruction, then the miraculous interference, by which Peter was saved to the Christians and Herod was lost to their enemies,

appears to us as the arm of the Lord shielding his young church.

And may we not see in this kindly protection of his church an amazing extension of mercy and of evidence to the nation also? The Savior's merciful offer of cumulative evidence to the rebellious nation has been noted previously, but an attempted summary and emphasis of it is now in place. The resurrection of Jesus should have been sufficient; to that is added the miracle of Pentecost; a church numbering thousands, and endued with marvelous powers of love and speech and prayer, rises up as if by magic; the apostles, being imprisoned, are miraculously released; Stephen's speech is irresistible; persecution itself ministers to the enlargement of the church, and now, in climax of evidence, if there can be climax after the resurrection, Peter is unaccountably delivered from prison, and Herod suffers an awful death. Surely in all this the Savior's pierced hands are still uplifted before the gaze of the nation, and the people are still invited to look, and believe, and cry out, as Thomas did, "My Lord and my God." Will this people never relent? Will they never repent? Will they forever stand in fierce opposition to incarnate love and reason? Will they persist in cherishing "the passions that make earth a hell?" "Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that are corrupters: they have forsaken the Lord, they have pro-

voked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward."

Repent or perish, was the burden of John the Baptist's message; it was the burden, likewise, of the preaching and the life of Jesus; and his church was still crying out with irresistible speech, and wonderful growth, and miracles of prayer and deliverance, Repent or perish! The warning is older than John the Baptist, and more recent also than Christ and his apostles. Isaiah repeats it many times in chapters of righteous wrath and deepest pathos; Jeremiah mingles it with his sobs and prayers and pleadings; and these greater prophets are joined by many a Minor Prophet, such as Micah and Hosea and Habakkuk, both in the sternness of their denunciation of sin and in the pathos of their plea for repentance. Gibbon in his "Decline and Fall of Rome," and Carlyle in his "French Revolution," and Victor Hugo in his "Les Misérables" are but modern voices upraised with the mighty comments of history in defense and confirmation of the ancient prophets.

> "The Lord will roar from Zion,
> From Jerusalem will he utter his voice;
> And the pastures of the shepherds will mourn,
> And the head of Carmel will be parched."

This from Amos is but one example of the everlasting warning against the consequences of sin. Or it may take this form:

"Rome shall perish; write that word
On the blood that she has spilt;
Perish, hopeless and abhorred,
Deep in ruin as in guilt."

Or it may take this form: "And as some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and gifts, he said: As for these things which ye behold, the days will come, in the which there shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." When we look for the comment of history upon this prediction of Jesus, and upon the course of the Israelites in their rejection and their attempted destruction of him, and in their rejection of his church and their attempted destruction of it, we have only to turn to the account of the siege of Jerusalem and the devastation of Judæa by the armies of Rome in the years of 69 and 70.

The murder of James, the arrest of Peter, and the intended general persecution, were steps of the downward way along which this nation was walking so consistently to ruin. The release of the Apostle Peter and the death of Herod were the plans of Providence protecting the church, and seeking to turn the nation from destruction.

Peter was saved by the punctiliousness of the king and the prayers of the Christians. Though the king would murder, and murder for political capital, yet he would not do it during the Passover. This gave the opportunity for earnest and united prayer in the apostle's behalf. Prayer is the language of

extremity, and the answer to it is God's opportunity. When Jesus was in agony he prayed, and when the members of his church could lift no hand of help to their leader they turned to God. And the prayers both of the Master and of his church were answered,—his in resignation, theirs by the angel of deliverance. While they were praying Peter was knocking at the door, for he had considered the thing, and he would make himself known; the news should run from house to house throughout the whole church, and in his deliverance the hand of the Lord should be exalted.

Here follows one of the strangest of the inconsistencies of our poor mortal style of faith. These Christians believed; they prayed; they had seen miracle upon miracle; yet they declared the maiden mad who reported to them the answer to their prayers; they were incredulous, they said: "It is his angel!" Are we not of the same lineage? Do we not reason while we pray, counting one by one, and saying: Here is the limit to the Lord's hand? Behold the two chains, and the two soldiers, and the prison door, and the keepers of the door, and the iron gate leading to the city! No, it is impossible. We will pray, but God cannot answer that way. May be Herod will relent. May be the people will not clamor for the apostle's death. May be—but God can break those chains and open those doors easier than move the hearts of that king and his stubborn people. The iron gate "opened to

them of his own accord," but the will of Herod moved not. Perhaps the Lord knows the easier way to the deliverance of his servants. Perhaps the lesser miracles astonish us most.

The death of Herod, so simply related and so summarily dismissed in this chapter, is described at length by Josephus as follows: "Now when Agrippa had reigned three years over all Judæa, he came to the city of Cæsarea, which was formerly called Strato's Tower, and there he exhibited shows in honor of Cæsar, upon his being informed that there was a certain festival celebrated to make vows for his safety. At which festival a great multitude was gotten together of the principal persons and such as were of dignity thoughout his province. On the second day of which shows he put on a garment made wholly of silver and of a contexture truly wonderful, and came into the theater early in the morning, at which time the silver of his garment being illumined by the fresh reflection of the sun's rays upon it, shone out after a surprising manner, and was so resplendent as to spread a dread and shuddering over those that looked intently upon it, and presently his flatterers cried out, one from one place, and another from another (though not for his good) that he was a god. And they added: Be thou merciful unto us, for although we have hitherto reverenced thee only as a man, yet we will henceforth own thee as superior to mortal nature. Upon this the king did

neither rebuke them nor reject their impious flattery. But as he presently afterwards looked up he saw an owl sitting upon a certain rope over his head, and immediately understood that this bird was the messenger of ill tidings, as it had once been the messenger of good tidings to him; and fell into the deepest sorrow. A violent pain also arose in his belly, having begun with great severity. He therefore looked upon his friends and said: 'I whom you call a god am commanded presently to depart this life, while Providence thus reproves the lying words you just now said to me, and I who was called by you immortal am immediately to be hurried away to death. But I am bound to accept what Providence allots as it pleases God, for we have by no means lived ill, but in a splendid, happy manner.' When he said this his pain became violent. Accordingly he was carried into the palace, and the rumor went abroad everywhere that he would certainly die in a little while. And when he had been quite worn out by the pain in his bowels for five days, he departed this life."

There are deaths that seem judicial. More than the course of nature and the force or the play of circumstances seems to be involved in this one of Herod. The death of Antiochus Epiphanes is a striking parallel to it. The account may be found in the ninth chapter of the Second book of Maccabees. Threatening to make Jerusalem the common burying-place of the Jews, he was smitten with a

remediless pain in the bowels; at last his flesh fell away; worms rose up out of him; his presence was unendurable to his army. Loathed by others and a horror to himself, he died finally in a strange country, in the mountains, branded by his historian as a murderer and a blasphemer. Charles IX. of France, who gave the order for the slaughter of the Huguenots, crying furiously, "Kill them all that none be left to reproach me," died in less than two years after the awful day of St. Bartholomew. Prof. Fisher says, "On his deathbed brief intervals of sleep were disturbed by horrible visions. He suffered from violent hemorrhages, and sometimes awoke bathed in blood, which recalled to his mind the torrents of blood shed by his orders on that dreadful night. In his dreams he beheld the bodies of the dead, floating on the Seine, and heard their agonizing cries." In company with these one other may be named whose cringing and shameful death was scarcely a match for his mean and murderous life. Nero, who was saluted as a god, and the savior of the world; who procured the murder of his mother; who kicked his second wife to death; who set Rome on fire, and played the fiddle while he saw it burning; who lit up his gardens with Christians dipped in tar and set blazing; who polluted politics, and degraded society, and contaminated everything that he touched; Nero, political harlequin, sensualist, clown, dilettante, coward, assassin, incendiary, persecutor, matricide, uxoricide, wholesale murderer, above all others the shame,

the terror, the brute, the fiend incarnate,—Nero, at last despised of Rome and deserted by his armies, kicked over the table where he was sitting, packed poison in a golden box expecting to need it, decided to mount the rostrum and appeal to the people, then threatened to rush into the Tiber, but set off instead to the villa of a friend, barefooted, in a faded coat, with masked face. Once there, cringing, whining, vacillating, he had not the courage to commit suicide. He ordered his grave digged; he collected marble for its adornment, and wood for his funeral pyre, and begged some one to show him how to die. In the last moment, when the horses' hoofs were clattering around him, and the centurion approached to arrest him, he held a dagger to his throat, and the hand of a literary slave thrust it in. As the death-stare came upon him they were surprised that his eyes should seem to be starting from his head. Would that of such dying wretches we could so much as speak in Schiller's fine phrase:

> "O thou sinner majestic,
> All thy terrible part is now played."

But these sinners are not majestic; they are mean.

Side by side in the twelfth chapter of Acts there rests the record of the first martyr apostle and the first king who dared to lay his hand upon an apostle. Peter and Paul perished under Nero, and Nero perished amidst political turmoils and personal terrors that were unspeakable. Jerusalem and Rome in the

persons of their representatives rejected the Savior of the world, and Josephus has painted for us in lurid pictures the destruction of the one, and Gibbon in stately chapters the fall of the other.

"Why do the heathen rage,
And the people imagine a vain thing?
The kings of the earth set themselves,
And their rulers take counsel together
Against the Lord, and against his Anointed, saying,
Let us break their bands asunder,
And cast away their cords from us.
He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh;
The Lord shall have them in derision.
Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings;
Be instructed, ye judges of the earth.
Serve the Lord with fear,
And rejoice with trembling.
Kiss the Son lest he be angry,
And ye perish from the way
When his wrath is kindled but a little.
Blessed are all they that put their trust in him."

VIII.

THE FIRST FOREIGN MISSIONARIES

"Paul as a missionary and shepherd of souls is great indeed. There is nothing in all antiquity to compare with the record of his travels and triumphs. Feeble in body, living by his toil like a working-man, this weaver of Tarsus enters the vast world of Paganism, another Alexander, to conquer the faith and the reason of mankind. Merely to form such a resolution was heroic. Darkness covered the earth; the peoples, to use the language of the prophet, were sitting in the valley and the shadow of death. Paul entered, alone at first, into these depths of darkness, with the Gospel torch in his hand; and wherever he went he left in his track from Damascus to Rome a succession of young expanding churches, the radiant centers of new life, the fruitful germs of modern society forming already in the midst of the old world. In all this, I repeat, there is something truly heroic."—*Sabatier.*

VIII.

THE FIRST FOREIGN MISSIONARIES.

"Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have appointed them."—*Acts xiii. 2.*

The Holy Spirit speaks. The church obeys. With fasting and prayer and the laying on of hands Barnabas and Saul are sent away. Thus the Antioch church sacrifices her foremost teachers, and becomes the mother of missions. A more memorable journey, under feebler human auspices, and fraught with greater consequences was never undertaken. Many a king in fullness of royal trappings, with armies following, has set out upon missions so mean that history has refused to take the smallest note of them; but these two poor Jews and their majestic mission will never be forgotten.

The Antioch Church was herself the result of missionary enterprise, but rather incidentally so than intentionally so. In her inception and growth the genius of Christianity outran the definite plans of its foremost advocates. Not the apostles and prophets of Jerusalem, but "men of Cyprus and Cyrene" first spoke to the Greeks in Antioch, "preaching the Lord Jesus." These men were not put forth by the Jerusalem church, but by the hand of persecution, and

their missionary work sprang from the daring spontaneity of Christian love. Divine love is a divine leaven, and whether systematically or otherwise, it works wherever it is, its affinity being for man as man. This is the secret both of sporadic and of systematic missions.

But now in the mission of Barnabas and Saul there is definiteness of purpose and plan. The circle widens. The church is in the pathway of progress. The genius of the Gospel asserts itself in a way hitherto untried. In the conversion of Cornelius, and the acknowledged legitimacy of the work among the Greeks of Antioch, the freedom of the Gospel from the forms of Mosaism has been declared. The very success of the Gospel in Antioch was the demonstration of its power over Gentiles and idolaters. Thus the foundation for foreign work was laid, and it was most fitting that the church in Antioch should build thereon.

It is highly significant that this new movement proceeded under the leadership of new men. Except for the council in Jerusalem "the apostles and elders" drop out of the history. Peter is lost sight of. From the home of Cornelius we follow him back to Jerusalem; we listen to his defense of that high deed of Gentile conversion in Cæsarea, and thereupon we practically bid him farewell. His primacy seems at an end, and the stage of history in the book of Acts is visited no more by the college of the twelve. Two apostles (for Barnabas and Saul are both called apos-

tles in Acts xiv. 14), unknown to the Pentecost Christians, take the leadership of the evangelistic movement, and fill the pages of its recital to the exclusion of all others. Let those who insist on the absoluteness of the number twelve, and on the continued primacy of Peter, note this addition to the number, and note also that if the Apostle Peter stood first on Pentecost and in the home of Cornelius, the Apostle Paul stands first in Cyprus, and Iconium, and Derbe, and Lystra, and Ephesus, and Philippi, and Athens, and Corinth, and Rome. The Holy Spirit is not bound to names or numbers, and there may be for us a lesson in the fact that the witnesses who were especially trained by the Master himself are now superseded by those who never knew him face to face in his mighty style of speech and deed.

The yoke-fellowship of Barnabas and Saul is delightful, and it is suggestive of the methods of the Holy Spirit that he should send these two tried friends forth on such a mission. Barnabas was the first to trust Saul and vouch for him in Jerusalem; when he needed a helper in Antioch he thought of Saul far away in Tarsus, and journeyed thither to find him; then he brought him to Antioch, and they worked together for a whole year; when there was a charity offering to be sent to Jerusalem, Barnabas and Saul were intrusted with it; they returned together from Jerusalem, and now they are sent out together to brave the hardships and dangers and sorrows and joys of missionary pioneering in a pagan

world. The friendship of Barnabas and Saul in the New Testament matches that of David and Jonathan in the Old, only the former is unfortunately marred at the last. Still, for all that dissension about Mark, no doubt they would both join David in saying each of the other,—

> "I am distressed for thee, my brother;
> Very pleasant hast thou been unto me;
> Thy love was wonderful, passing the love of women."

Barnabas' fitness for the foreign field is seen in this, that he was an experienced Christian, having been very early a member of the Jerusalem church; that he was self-sacrificing and generous, having given his property to the church; that he was gifted in the ministries of exhortation and consolation; that he was quick to love and trust and see the better side of everybody, as shown in his ready reception of Saul, and the introduction he gave him to the mother church; and that already he had had experience in Antioch, which was at the first practically a foreign field. In its inception he seems to have been the leader in the work, having been first trusted by the Jerusalem church, and first named by the Antioch church. Early in their first tour abroad, however, Saul's name was changed to Paul (Ch. xiii. 9), and from that time on he was the recognized leader in the work. At a later date Barnabas developed two points of weakness; in Antioch he was "carried away" by the dissimulation of Peter and the prejudices of certain Jerusalem Judaizers, and in Paul's

opinion his love for his nephew John Mark warped his judgment in the choice of a fellow minister for their proposed second journey. Paul would have nothing to do with a deserter. "So Barnabas took Mark and sailed away to Cyprus," and thereafter we hear nothing of them except as they are mentioned in a generous way by Paul in various of his letters. Evidently Mark was restored to the confidence of Paul, and became "profitable to him for the ministry." (II. Tim. iv. 11). Perhaps both Paul and Barnabas were excusable for the quarrel. At all events, the missionary forces were doubled, and later reconciliations followed.

The parting of the ways of these two missionaries is the signal at which the writer of Acts drops the curtain upon Barnabas, as previously upon Peter. During the years 47 and 48 they labored together; in 50 they visited Jerusalem together in behalf of the liberty of the Gentiles; in 51 they parted, and the rest of Acts from that date, beginning with the fortieth verse of the fifteenth chapter, is devoted to the labors and trials of the Apostle Paul. This portion of the book may therefore be called a missionary manual, or it may be styled the biography of the prince of missionaries.

In attempting to speak of St. Paul's apostleship, or what is the same, his missionary character and career, one feels the burden both of the greatness of the theme and the wealth of material. Even Luke's missionary biography is not an adequate

presentation of the man and of his work; our hero's autobiography must be taken into account, and that means the whole of his thirteen epistles. To the greater purposes of his writings an autobiography was incidental, but inevitable. No one would accuse him of setting out intentionally upon such a poor business as the writing of an autobiography, but his life was so identified with his works that in telling about the latter he must bring whole pages out of the former. His tears, his groans, his prayers, his joys, his logic, and his love were in the churches he established, and they are also in the pages he has written. The defense of his apostolic office, the recital of the perils and persecutions he endured, his championship of Gentile Christianity, and his reasons for it, his fatherly care of the churches, his passionate love of Christ, his heroic endurance in the cause of Christ; and the background to all this, the hatred, the zeal, the conscience with which he once persecuted Christ—in short, the soul of the man with its storms and revolutions, with its peace and prayers and bitter tears, with its unconquerable faith and unspeakable visions, and finally, with its eager expectancy of the crown of life eternal, speaks in every one of his immortal letters. His soul is a part of his style. His pen was vital with his own blood. If he wrote at all he could not but produce an autobiography. For this reason his epistles must be in our mind's eye quite as much as

the book of Acts while a feeble attempt is made to characterize him.

It is not proposed to speak here of the Apostle Paul's missionary work, but of his equipments and character as a missionary. Nature was lavish in her endowments upon him of mind and heart and will. He was perfectly balanced in love, in logic, and in purpose, and his mold was that of a giant. His home life in Tarsus must have contributed in a goodly degree to his knowledge of Greek, and of the Greek-speaking, pagan peoples of Western Asia. To such a nature as his this would bring by revulsion a more intensely Jewish, but also, after his conversion, a more cosmopolitan style of thought. His education in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel gave him an intimate acquaintance with the law of Moses, and made him a zealot for the traditions of his race. The reflection of his pride and zeal in race and caste and legalism is in many a passage of his epistles, where the experience is turned to good account in his debates with Judaizing Christians. "If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more; circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, as touching the law, a Pharisee; concerning zeal, persecuting the church; touching the righteousness which is of the law, blameless." Such was Saul when he stood listening to the speech of Stephen, and holding the

clothes of the enraged men who stoned him to death. A typical man, only that he was a Jew; a typical Jew, only that he was born in a foreign city; a typical Pharisee, only that he was honest; and a typical inquisitor, only that he was converted. Farrar has invited us to note that many times in the providence of God the destroyer of a creed or system has been bred in its inmost bosom. Sakya Mouni, in Brahminism; Luther, in Augustinianism; Pascal, in Jesuitism; Wesley and Whitefield, in Anglicanism; Paul, in Phariseeism. Revulsion against false and deadly systems is a mighty inspiration to great and honest souls. Paul had the inspiration of a double revulsion, first from the heathen environment of his childhood home; and secondly, from the equally deadly, if not quite so abominable, Pharisaic environment of his manhood home, and legal studies.

Add to all this his point blank conversion. His change was a complete "about face." In a double sense he was smitten to the earth, and in a double sense he saw a light above the brightness of the sun. Where the first inquisitor fell to the ground on his way to Damascus there fell also his pride and his prejudice, the former in his own people, and the latter against aliens; in his baptism he buried his old life, and ever afterward counted it but refuse that he might win Christ, and be found of him, not having his own righteousness. From his baptism he arose in newness of life to walk with Christ.

There is nothing half and half about him. With the Apostle Peter, release from the law was a long process, requiring repeated revelations, and continual supervision of the Holy Spirit; with the Apostle Paul this release was like the snapping of a chain, and the fall of dungeon walls, and the flash of noonday light. Immediately he seized upon the genius of the Gospel, and the logic of love became to him the soul of liberty. Where others of his race groped and stumbled, he saw and ran; and the conclusions to which they were forced by stress of facts, he seized by grasp of intuition. The absolute and sudden revolution in his mental attitude is, from every human standpoint, a psychological enigma, and critics adverse to the Gospel have pronounced it a miracle. His cry when smitten to the earth, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" was his oath of allegiance to his new-found Lord. It was, to him, what a Roman soldier would have called the sacramentum. All his reverence for the fathers, all his allegiance to the law of the fathers, he transferred suddenly and irreversibly to Christ. Like a man who is lost, and suddenly finds himself in an old and familiar spot, the world swung round. His faith was fixed forever; his repentance was revolutionary; scales fell from his eyes; Christ became to him a sun always at meridian; he uttered the word, "Lord," and the word went with him to his dying day. These factors, namely, by way of summary, his rich native endowments, his liberal education, mingled

of Greek and Hebrew elements, and his thorough conversion accompanied with revulsion from pagan idolatry and Jewish legalism, made him the champion of liberal Christianity. He saw the antithesis in nature, and the inevitable conflict in practice between love and law; between prohibition and inspiration; between deadly technicality and a vital spirituality. It required such a soul to break the crust of custom, and to declare an emancipation from the carnal ordinances and empty types of Mosaism; to show that circumcision was nothing, and uncircumcision nothing; to rebuke the Gentile Christians for trying to follow the lead of Judaizers in the observance of Mosaic clean meats and new moons and Sabbaths; and to put baptism with Christ, newness of manhood in Christ, and the exaltation of the cross of Christ in absolute, and glorious, and everlasting antithesis to all mere legalism, and formalism, and dogmatism, and sectarianism, and idolatry of every sort. In the person of Peter Christianity had its "apostle of the rock;" in John, its "apostle of love;" in Paul, its apostle of emancipation and evangelization.

And his work of emancipation is not done so long as the church is burdened with rituals, and mummeries, and legalistic notions of the New Testament, which usurp the place in the soul of a vital kinship with Christ, which are like a continual malaria to spirituality, and which impede the way of progress; nor his work of evangelization, so long as hundreds

of millions of our race still sit in darkness and in the shadow of death. It was by no accident that Luther espoused the book of Galatians, claiming it for his bride, and that the Reformation followed. It was not by feeble insight into the needs of his times that he called the book of Romans "the masterpiece of the New Testament, and the purest Gospel," assuring us that it can never be too much studied, and that the more it is handled the more precious it becomes. It would seem morally impossible to come under the mastery of the Apostle Paul's thought, and still dote upon the jots and tittles, the trifles and technicalities, that vex misguided disciples and minds of smaller mould than his. In the reasonable sacrifice of our own living bodies, all other sacrifices, whether upon Jewish or pagan altars, are, from his standpoint, forever fulfilled, and done for, and forgotten. In the Sabbath rest that remains for the children of God, the everlasting peace of soul that comes of repentance and forgiveness, all other Sabbaths find their full significance and their permanent antitype, and the Mosaic rest days are transplaced by Christian memorial ones. Under his plea for justification by faith, the whole of that baneful, all but world-wide trust in the meritoriousness of works goes down absolutely; and under his law of love, coupled with expediency, a thousand of our questions, whether trifling or important, about times, and seasons, and rituals, and vestments, and choirs, and societies, and gov-

ernments, and amusements even, are at once removed from the arena of legalistic and dogmatic debate, to that of prayer and brotherly counsel, and "the common sense of most." Such was the man whom the Holy Spirit thrust forth into the pagan world to be first and freest, the ablest and safest herald of the cross to those peoples whence there has sprung by the lapse of centuries our Western Christendom. The divine wisdom of the choice may be seen by way of contrast in the deplorable misfits that sometimes get themselves into our mission fields nowadays,—small souls, the mouthpieces of a hobby or a whim; the lispers of provincial shibboleths; the infallible dogmatists, who cannot forget that they are the tools of a party or a sect, while presuming to herald a Savior whose truth and love are as universal and unfettered as the rains and rays that his Father and ours sends upon the good and bad alike. It is deplorable when gnat-strainers get into mission fields, microscopically searching out this small wing of heresy, and that small leg of irregularity, omitting, meanwhile, the weightier matters of mercy and truth, and swallowing much (as is the rule with such characters) that is big with personal animosity, and bitter with sectarian hatred and strife.

A few other points must be noted as factors in the problem of the Apostle Paul's immense influence. The word missionary itself is suggestive of the first that may be named. Translated, the word

apostle must read missionary, just as the word baptize, translated, must read immerse. Thus we should read, "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be a missionary, separated unto the Gospel of God." (Romans i. 1.) And again, "Paul, called to be a missionary of Jesus Christ through the will of God." (I. Cor. i. 1.) And again, "Paul, a missionary not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead." (Gal. i. 1.) The thought of sending, as embodied in this word, was a predominant one with Christ, and the thought of being sent became predominant with his chiefly chosen twelve. After a night of prayer he called to him his disciples, "and he chose from them twelve, whom he named missionaries." (Luke vi. 13.) In many a form the Master reiterates the thought. "I chose you and appointed you that ye should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should abide." "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you." This last while he was breathing upon them and saying, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit." This act stands very close, both in point of time and in the Scripture context, to our Lord's final message to his missionaries, the crown of all his instructions, namely, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." The Apostle Paul came under the complete mastery of this predominant thought. Though he acknowledged himself as one "born out of due time," and "not meet to be called a mis-

sionary because he persecuted the church of God," yet he never failed to defend himself as one distinctively sent of Christ. His life was wrought out under this ruling ideal. His mission was to be Christ's missionary. To this end he magnified his office. In utter abandonment of self he made full proof of his ministry, seeking by every means lawful and by all things expedient to honor his "high calling of God in Christ."

Again: He came under the mastery of Christ's simple and predominant creed. The Apostle Peter saw no more clearly than the Apostle Paul that Christ is all and in all. His creed was Christ. He said, "I know whom I have believed." Christ, to the Jews a stumbling-block, to the Greeks foolishness, was to him the power of God, and the wisdom of God. Into whatever dark places daylight creeps, it may still be traced back to the sun. So of the activities and the teachings of Paul; back to Christ they all run, proclaiming him as their source. This singleness of creed, bodied forth in the sublime personality of Jesus, and declared and defended by Paul, exclusively, and without compromise, gave him immense power over decadent Mosaism and the destructive idolatries of the pagan world. Through the preaching of Christ and the resurrection of Christ, he wrought moral and spiritual revolution wherever he went. Among the idolaters of Ephesus, the philosophers of Athens, and the rulers of Rome, he lifted up his voice alike in the name of Christ, glorying

in the cross, saying, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile." This made him an iconoclast of old and futile forms; a destroyer of hateful and harmful distinctions between man and man; a champion of liberty and progress to the church and the world; a wise master-builder of churches; a father to young men in the ministry; a collector and distributer of alms, and an unrivaled writer of letters to the churches and children of his Gospel ministry and love.

Again: The Apostle Paul came under the power of a predominant purpose. "Buried with Christ in baptism,"—it is his own phrase—he arose "to walk in newness of life." As he voices the unity of his creed in many forms of speech, so he gives expression to his singleness of purpose in a multitude of texts: "For me to live is Christ; to die is gain." "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son of God." "This one thing I do: forgetting the things that are behind, I press toward the mark of the prize of our high calling in Christ Jesus." "I determined to know nothing among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." "Ye are all the sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free,

there can be no male and female; for ye are one in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself." "We in Christ's stead pray you, be ye reconciled to God." This is a hasty gleaning of texts showing the all-inclusive because all-exclusive purpose of Paul. He narrowed that he might deepen the channel of his life. The losing of life in order to find it is the secret of all great living. This was Paul's attainment as it was Christ's commandment, and it is admirable. It made him a tower of strength to the infant church, and a blessing to all ages. Having written himself down in a lowly way as the "bond-servant" of Jesus Christ, he has shown us in his life such exaltation as comes only by the way of the readiest, lowliest, loftiest service. Surely if our Lord ever had a servant upon earth who could with right and with reverence lay claim to the stigmata of the Master himself, saying, "I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus," that servant was the missionary Paul, in labors more abundant than others, "in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft."

In the last place, he came under the power of a predominant love. Farrar in his life of Paul calls the thirteenth chapter of I. Corinthians "the most glorious gem, even in the writings of St. Paul." John is known pre-eminently as the apostle of love, but he nowhere excels Paul in his teachings regarding

love unless it is when he gathers up the whole philosophy of creation and religion in that sublime trinity of words, "God is love." Moses proved himself the worthy leader of a great people in that he was willing to die for them, and his strenuous, determined, anxious care for them rushes to its climax of expression in this self-sacrificial prayer: "Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of the book which thou hast written." Paul reaches the same climax of human love for his "kinsmen according to the flesh" when he says, "I could wish myself accursed from Christ for them." Such words are so foreign to us that they astonish us, and we try to explain them away. But Paul meant what he said. That height and depth of love, however foreign it may be to a church shamefully self-complacent in non-apostolic, non-missionary lethargy, was to Paul an inspiration born of the self-sacrificial love of Jesus. Moses was a type of Christ; Paul was Christ's disciple; the one is a forerunner, the other a follower of the Christ. Yet they stand side by side in a devotion to their people that was glorious, and side by side also in their exaltation to an eminence of love wherein they are surpassed only by One, and to that One they both direct us, saying, each in his appropriate and peculiar way, "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world."

Such was the man whom the Holy Spirit chose, saying, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have appointed them," and who

was sent forth into the world of reeking paganism that gathered around the Mediterranean Sea in order to "kindle a fire of faith that should burn to its very water's edge," but who in doing so was called upon to front every form of peril by sea and by land, among idolaters and among false brethren; was called upon to endure—but no language can match his own—"Thrice was I beaten with rods; once was I stoned; thrice I suffered shipwreck; a night and a day I have been in the deep. In weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Besides those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches. Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is made to stumble, and I burn not? If I must needs glory, I will glory in the things that concern my weakness. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, he who is blessed forevermore, knoweth that I lie not."

A chain of churches marked his pathway, and in Cæsar's household Christians were found before he died; and though under the worst of emperors his poor body was led to martyrdom out along the Ostian way, yet within three hundred years a successor to that emperor became himself a confessor of Christ; and along the mighty roadways of Rome, upon which her armies had marched forth to war and had returned in triumph, there passed many and many a missionary of the cross, heralding in peace the name of the Prince of Peace.

Other missionaries have equaled or even surpassed the Apostle Paul in special directions, but not one has been his compeer in the totality of his sufferings and achievements. William Carey surpassed him as a linguist; perhaps Adoniram Judson equaled him in physical endurance and sufferings for Christ's sake; David Livingstone was a heroic sufferer and a greater pioneer; Henry Martyn reminds us of him in the energy and intensity of his movements, and the permanent impression he made wherever he went; in martyrdom there have been many who died as unwaveringly as he. But taken for all in all it is the judgment of students that no saint has equaled him.

> "The elements were
> So mixed in him, that Nature might stand up,
> And say to all the world, This was a man."

As a pioneer missionary, building "not on other men's foundations;" as a "wise master builder of churches;" as a defender, on the one hand of the liberty of the church against Judaizers, and on the other of the faith of the church against philosophists; as the creator of a literature received above all others as unimpeachable and canonical; as discriminating with absolute nicety between the essential and the expedient in Gospel work and worship; as a sympathizer even unto tears with the weeping, unto joys with the joyous, and unto heart burnings with those who stumbled; as a fearless proclaimer of the cross and the resurrection of Jesus; as a tender

and pathetic pleader for souls; as an inspirer of men; as a distributer of alms; and finally, as a ready and triumphant martyr, he stands before the world as its accepted foremost saint. And standing thus in his lonely grandeur, he asks us to forget him while we behold the Christ in him, calling himself the chief of sinners while we behold him as the chief of saints.

His epitaph is chiseled by his own hand, not in marble, but upon the heart of the world wherever Christ is loved, and wherever history is true to her noblest treasures: "I have fought a good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give to me at that day; and not to me only, but to them also that love his appearing."

IX.

THE FIRST FOREIGN MISSIONARY JOURNEY

"How easy it must have been for Jews of the Diaspora, who had been converted when visiting Jerusalem at their festivals, to induce some of them (the apostles) to carry the Gospel to their countrymen outside; or other members of the primitive Church might in their commercial travels bear the Gospel to the synagogues of the Diaspora. But this spread of the Gospel was entirely incidental, and the Acts are right in representing the organized missionary journey of Barnabas and Saul as an epoch-making event."—*Weiss.*

IX.

THE FIRST FOREIGN MISSIONARY JOURNEY.

"So they being sent forth by the Holy Spirit, departed unto Seleucia; and from thence they sailed unto Cyprus."—*Acts xiii. 4.*

It was a dreadful world into which Barnabas and Saul were sent. In many a passage, but especially in the first chapter of his letter to the Romans, the Apostle Paul has set the brand of infamy upon it, and, Cain-like, it must bear that brand forever. Ancient paganism was a sink of perdition with modern parallels nowhere except among modern pagans and idolaters. Only those who know heathenism in the centers of its influence can appreciate the apostle's terrible arraignment of it. Our missionaries who return to us from the islands of the Pacific, and from India and China and Africa, and from lands dominated by the grosser forms of Roman Catholicism, tell us that we know nothing of the spiritual darkness that broods like a pall over the very temples of idolatry; of the social distress and the fearful sins that destroy men's lives here and forever, and of the thraldom of superstition that forbids like a chaos the entrance of order. Buddha and Brahma and Confucius have done nothing to lift their peoples above the grossest forms of idolatry, and the physical tortures and shockingly obscene rites that too fre-

quently accompany idol worship. The misguided devotees of Brahmanism aud Buddhism and fetishism have been led to the cultivation rather than the destruction of castes and class distinctions with their inexpressible hatreds and their innumerable cruelties; they have not frowned upon polygamy and lechery and base tantric forms of worship; they have not forbidden widow-burning and infanticide and human sacrifices; they have enslaved men; they have degraded women; they have adored cattle and monkeys; they have worshiped snakes and devils; they have neglected the poor, the sick, and the insane, except to torture them with exorcisms; and myriads upon myriads of men and women have been left to corrupt themselves in those things that they know naturally as brute beasts.

The ancient idolaters and the modern ones are therefore alike described by Paul when he says, "Even as they refused to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up to a reprobate mind to do those things that are not fitting; being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, unmerciful; who, knowing the ordinance of God, that they that practice such things are worthy of death, not only do

the same, but also consent with them that practice them."

Farrar suggests that Tarsus itself, the birthplace of Paul, was, because of its paganism and its pollutions, no unfit burial-place for Julian the Apostate. "The seat of a celebrated school of letters," he says, "it was at the same time the metropolis of a province so low that it was counted among the three most villainous k's of antiquity, Kappadokia, Kilikia and Krete. What religion there was at this period had chiefly assumed an orgiastic and oriental character, and the popular faith of many even in Rome was a strange mixture of Greek, Roman, Egyptian, Phrygian, Phœnician and Jewish elements. The wild fanatical enthusiasms of the Eastern cults shook with new sensations of mad sensuality and weird superstition the feeble and jaded despair of Aryan paganism. The Tarsian idolatry was composed of these mingled elements. . . .

"The traditional founder of the city was the Assyrian, Sardanapalus, whose semi-historic existence was confused, in the then syncretism of pagan worship, with various representatives of the sun-god—the Asiatic Sandan, the Phœnician Baal and the Grecian Hercules. The gross allusiveness and origin of this worship, its connection with the very types and ideals of luxurious effeminacy, unbounded gluttony and brutal license, were quite sufficient to awake the indignant loathing of each true-hearted Jew. And these revolts of natural antipathy must have

been intensified with patriotic disgust in the hearts of a people in whom true religion has ever been united with personal purity when they saw that at the main festival of this degraded cult the effeminate Sardanapalus and masculine Semiramis, each equally detestable, were worshiped with rites which externally resembled the pure and thankful rejoicings of the Feast of Tabernacles. St. Paul must have witnessed this festival. He must have seen at Anchiale the most defiant symbol of cynical contentment with all which is merely animal in the statue of Sardanapalus, represented as snapping his fingers while he uttered the sentiment engraved upon the pedestal,

'Eat, drink, and enjoy thyself, the rest is nothing.'"

Godet says that the Apostle Paul's picture of the unnatural vices prevalent in Gentile society is confirmed "in all points by the frightful details contained in the works of Greek and Latin writers."

Macaulay has left us, in his "Fragments of a Roman Tale," a description of the utter moral laxity among the noble Romans in the days of Cæsar and Cicero. Revelry, gambling, conspiracy, lewdness, brawls and assassinations filled the minds and occupied the time of an aristocracy rendered inordinately brutal by wars and inordinately rich by conquests.

If anything were wanting as an evidence of the coarse cruelty and inhuman abandonment of the times it would be abundantly supplied by the barest description of the amphitheaters, and of the bloody

plays demanded by the people and furnished by their rulers. More and more the old martial spirit, cultivated by generations of warfare, took to gloating itself upon scenes of bloodshed deliberately planned and executed for the Roman holidays. The crimes of Nero and Caligula did not prevent them from standing well with the people so long as they were able to furnish bread and games for the unemployed, and that class included nearly the whole of the population minus the slaves, who did the work, and of whom there were sixty millions in the empire. In the time of the republic sixty-six days in the year were given up to shows; during the empire, a hundred and seventy-three. The expenses were enormous, sometimes reaching as much as $75,000.00 on a single performance. "In the year 80 A. D., Titus gave a show that lasted a hundred days, and exhibited in one day five thousand wild animals." In the games at Berytus he compelled thousands of Jews to fight and die. As if to color the degradation and cruelty of the age by an unintentional sarcasm, this emperor was seriously called "the darling of the human race." Trajan (98 to 117 A. D.) gave a show that lasted four months, in which he exhibited ten thousand men and eleven thousand wild beasts. Claudius (41 to 54 A. D.) entertained Rome with a sham sea fight in which nineteen thousand men were engaged. Augustus, who was emperor when Christ was born, testified in a codicil to his will that he had exhibited eight thousand men and three thousand

five hundred and ten wild beasts. At a comic performance dwarfs were set to fighting dwarfs, and every expedient was tried and no cruelty shunned to bring out new sensations. "Prisoners would appear on the stage in gorgeous clothes, from which suddenly flames would burst forth and consume them. Ixion was seen on his wheel. Mucius Scaevola was seen to put his hand into a coal fire and keep it there till it was burned off. Orpheus was presented with his harp amid a smiling nature, to all appearances charmed with his music. When the spectators began to grow weary with the show a wild beast would rush out from the foliage and tear him to pieces amid the laughter of the public."

When a victim was down and put up his hand pleading for his life he might be spared if the people put up their fingers; but he must be finished if they turned down their thumbs. The women who thronged the amphitheaters were usually quick to say by the latter sign, "Do him to death." Once when food was scarce for the beasts in the menagerie Caligula proposed to feed them on criminals. If a gladiator showed fear he was prodded forward into the battle with hot irons.

The emperors while thus engaged in slaughtering beasts and murdering men for the amusement of the people, were prone to dote upon mistresses and race horses. Caligula had a horse that he fed from a marble manger, sometimes, however, inviting him to his own table, and dining him on almonds and

raisins. The licentiousness and trifling of the emperors were in turn imitated by the people, and found public expression in shows that were as shameful as those above described were cruel. Charles Loring Brace tells us in a significant paragraph that "the extremes to which licentious shows were carried can not even be explained in modern writings." He says, "In fact, few classical scholars who have not waded through the disgusting mire of a large part of Roman literature, can have any idea of the depth of obscenity and immorality which it reached. Athenæus, Petronius, Apuleius (in his lighter works), Juvenal, and many others, only show how debased even genius and talent may become under such influences as so much of the Greek and Roman religions furnished. Even the universal suffering and ruin of the Roman Empire had no influence on the public appetite for these enjoyments. In Salvian's bitter epigram, the empire *ridet et moritur*, laughs while dying."

Again he says, speaking of the same and other writers: "It is not that, like Juvenal, they pick out extreme immoralities for a biting sarcasm; but they allude casually and without shame to excesses and habitual vices whose very name is lost to modern ears. Even Cicero says soberly that it was held a disgrace among the Greeks not to indulge in unnatural vices. He did not say that his own countrymen fell even lower."

Such was the "heartless cruelty, the unfathomable

corruption," and the disgusting frivolity of the peoples for whom the philosophy of Socrates, the morals of Seneca, and the politics of Cæsar had done their utmost. Slaves that were not wanted were slain; wives that were not wanted were divorced; children that were not wanted were abandoned. By and by emperors that were not wanted were assassinated, and the soldiers put the empire up for sale to the highest bidder. That was the style of world produced by the boasted arts of Greece, the laws of Rome, and the swords of the Cæsars.

However, the very failure of philosophy and art and idolatry and legislation and conquest, in short, of the forces at work in the ancient world, to produce happiness and purity and permanence must be looked upon as a negative preparation for the coming of Christ. By doing its utmost, and by failing in its utmost, humanity learned to despair of itself. It proved "adequately and magnificently both that it could not save itself, and how splendidly worth saving it was."

> "Eternal hopes are man's,
> Which when they should maintain themselves aloft
> Want due consistence; like a pillar of smoke,
> That with majestic energy from earth
> Rises, but, having reached the thinner air,
> Melts and dissolves, and is no longer seen."

A true estimate of the preparation in history for Christ and his message cannot fail to include the facts of Greek civilization and Roman government.

The above was a negative preparation, but these were positive. More marvelous than the conquests of Alexander were the permanent results that he left behind him. The historian Arnold, as quoted by Creasy, says: "Asia beheld with astonishment and awe the uninterrupted progress of a hero, the sweep of whose conquests was as wide and rapid as that of her own barbaric kings, or of the Scythian or Chaldean hordes; but, far unlike the whirlwinds of Asiatic warfare, the advance of the Macedonian leader was no less deliberate than rapid. At every step the Greek power took root, and the language and the civilization of Greece were planted from the shores of the Ægean to the banks of the Indus, from the Caspian and the great Hyrcanian plain to the cataracts of the Nile; to exist actually for nearly a thousand years, and in their influence to endure forever."

Creasy, in his "Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World," says: "Within thirty years after Alexander crossed the Hellespont the Greek language was spoken in every country from the shores of the Ægean to the Indus, and also throughout Egypt—not indeed wholly to the extirpation of the native dialects, but it became the language of every court, of all literature, of every judicial and political function, and formed a medium of communication among the many myriads of mankind inhabiting those large portions of the Old World."

Rome conquered where Greece had conquered, but

she did not drive out the language and the influence of Greece. To her was committed the mission of legislation and centralization. With imperial recklessness of cost she bridged rivers and tunneled mountains and paved her roadways to the limits of her domains. Over these she sent out her armies to garrison and hold, or to invade and conquer, and through her armies she impressed her imperious will upon the world at her feet, bringing at least political order out of what had previously been a chaos. Augustus, through his long and peaceful reign, held the provinces of the empire as in a leash, imposing laws upon the conquered nations as effectually as the Greeks had imposed their language.

When these two facts are placed together there is furnished the explanation of the following thoughtful paragraph: "Follow St. Paul and see his circuits; watch him claiming the safeguard of the same Roman citizenship in the Macedonian town and the capital of Palestine, laying hold at Cæsarea on the horns of a central tribunal at Rome, borne thither by the sails of the carrying trade in the 'ship of Alexandria,' meditating a journey into Spain, numbering among his Roman converts, as seems probable, one who had a direct connection with Roman Britain, writing in the same Greek to Rome and to the highlanders of Galatia, never crossed in his journeys by any track of war, never stopped by challenge of frontier or custom house; these are so many object lessons to show what the 'Pax Romana' and the

Roman unity of power and organization imported for the growth of a world-religion."

History, the most accurate and truly philosophical, is the best commentary on the Apostle Paul's profound observation, "When the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son." It was in the same opportune time that the apostle himself and his fellow-workers were sent forth, a time marked by religious perversion and moral decay on the one hand, by unity of Greek culture and Roman dominion on the other.

Into that world, therefore, though all too briefly and inadequately described, Barnabas and Paul were sent forth. It was an enterprise full of the beauty of holiness and the sublimity of faith. When nations set themselves against nations, it is with the barbarous splendor of thousands upon thousands of armed men; but when the Lord sets himself against a world in wickedness, it is in the persons thus of two lonely men, without sword or shield, and armed only with the story upon their lips of a third Man who had died on a Roman cross, "whom they affirmed to be alive." There is the more than martial tread of a divine heroism through the whole history of missions. The missionary walks by faith, not by sight, and as his commission is divine, so his victory is preassured.

Setting sail from Seleucia, Barnabas and Saul must have felt that they were consecrating their little merchant ship to new uses, and that her white sails were made by their mission the wings of peace and

love and forgiveness. The Mediterranean Sea was called, from its commercial importance, "The Marriage Ring of Nations." Through the work of these missionaries it was destined to become, within little more than a generation, the marriage ring of churches of the redeemed.

The chief incidents of this first missionary journey are the conversion of Sergius Paulus, the preaching and persecution in Pisidian Antioch, the preaching and persecution in Iconium, the preaching and persecution in Lystra, and the preaching in Derbe; then upon the return journey, the confirming of the churches, and the ordaining of elders in each of them.

Sergius Paulus, the proconsul of the island of Cyprus, is described as "a prudent man, who called for Barnabas and Saul and desired to hear the word of God." At the same time he was keeping with him Elymas the sorcerer, a false prophet, a renegade Jew, calling himself Bar-jesus. Judged by his equals and superiors in Roman society, Sergius Paulus was not censurable for keeping his household prophet, though of such a character. Through all ages those who have been devoid of the knowledge of the true God and of trust in him, have been the victims of false prophets, magicians, sorcerers, wizards, witches, astrologers, sibyllists, augurs, casters of horoscopes, dream interpreters, spiritualistic mediums, strolling fortune-tellers, mahatmas, or some such quack miracle venders. Pharaoh had his magicians; Nebuchad-

nezzar, his astrologers; Saul, when he had lost God, sought the witch of Endor, and there were scarcely any of the heroes of Greece or the rulers of Rome who were not in some way or other the patrons of Delphic oracles, or Pythian priestesses, or dreamers, or prognosticators, or ventriloquists, or deceivers of some sort. "There was scarcely a Roman family that did not keep or consult its own fortune-teller, and Juvenal describes the Emperor Tiberias as seated with a herd of Chaldeans on his rock at Capri." The emperors Nero and Vespasian and Domitian, all of whom persecuted Christians, entertained each a superstitious regard for his pet sorcerers.

Naturally, this household sorcerer withstood Barnabas and Saul, seeking to turn away the proconsul from the faith. Strangely enough, such abnormal people are the first to recognize the man with a holy mission, and to confess him. The demonized man in the synagogue at Capernaum was the first to confess Christ, saying, "Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God." The instincts of fear are supernaturally quick, and in such matters they are inerrant. At St. Paul's rebuke Elymas was smitten with blindness, and Sergius Paulus became a believer, "being astonished at the doctrine of the Lord."

It was probably in the year 47 that the rulers and elders in the synagogue in Pisidian Antioch noticed

two strangers seated among the worshipers there, and sent to them, saying (in a way that seems to us delightfully antique and fraternal), "Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on." They little dreamed of the storm they were inviting. Led by this invitation, the Apostle Paul "stood up, and beckoning with the hand, said, Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, give audience." Thereupon he delivered a sermon (xiii. 17-41), the outlines of which may be clearly traced in that of the martyr Stephen. There is the same historic background, there is a similar use of prophecy, there is the declaration of the Messiahship of Jesus, and in both there is the same fearful warning against the rejection of Jesus, enforced by the mournful historic rejection of the prophets of Israel by the fathers of Israel. Stephen's sermon was not lost upon the young man who held the clothes of his murderers, and in the providence of God Paul the apostle is more than a compensation for Stephen the martyr. This sermon was the honest and daring confession of a mistaken man. Ten years before, possibly fourteen, Paul had sanctioned the murder of Stephen for preaching that sermon, but he could not murder the sermon. It lived in his soul, and lived the more vitally there since it was eloquent with a brother's blood, still "crying to him from the ground." He must have pondered over that sermon, and prayed and wept over it. And now, having nurtured it in his soul with prayers and tears and meditations,

the opportune time has come for its delivery, and he will preach it, though he, too, must put his life in jeopardy for it. No wonder that nearly the whole city should be roused by such a preparation and delivery of sermons. They were not able to resist the wisdom and spirit with which this new Stephen spake.

But the Apostle Paul, in this Antioch sermon, makes two noteworthy advances upon Stephen. The latter was cut off before he could declare the resurrection of Jesus; Paul declares it fully. Probably Stephen would not have declared the insufficiency of the law of Moses as contrasted with the all-sufficiency of the Gospel. This Paul does in the following words, which are the first statement of a position that he was afterward to maintain and defend by much reasoning and under many persecutions.

"Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses."

Meyer suggests that this is but the major premise of the proposition; that the minor premise, namely, by the law of Moses there can be no justification, is prudently left to be inferred. This doctrine of justification by faith, with its antithesis, no justification by law, is in reality but another voicing of the soteriology preached by the Apostle Peter on the day of Pentecost. In his answer to inquiring believers,

"Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins," there is implied the same antithesis as regards the law. He, too, leaves a minor premise prudently unexpressed. But this minor premise of salvation, namely, freedom from the law of works with its implied meritoriousness, prudently unexpressed on the day of Pentecost, and now but half expressed by the Apostle Paul, was destined to become the one great root of bitterness in the Apostolic Church. And again, after fifteen hundred years of church history, mostly mournful, the Apostle Paul's major and minor premises of salvation were destined to become the logic of liberty from the bondage of Roman Catholicism. There are striking parallels on the one hand between the Jewish church of the first century and the Romish church of the sixteenth, and on the other, between Paul the emancipator from the one and Luther the emancipator from the other. The beginnings of history are hidden in the souls of the heroes of history. When Saul of Tarsus cried out, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" there, in his expressed heart-loyalty to the Lordship of Jesus, was the beginning of more than a biography. When Martin Luther was ascending Pilate's staircase in Rome upon his knees, counting beads, rosary in hand, with the promise of absolution awaiting him on the top stair, there came to his mind the text, "The just shall live by faith." He arose and fled in shame and humiliation from the place, and that was

the beginning of the Reformation. The theses against indulgences were a consequence of the inspiration born in that supreme moment. It is true that Luther himself says of the theses, "In fourteen days they ran clear through all Germany, for all the world was complaining about the indulgences; and because all the bishops and doctors were silent, and nobody was willing to bell the cat, Luther became a renowned doctor, because at last somebody took hold of the thing." But it was Paul's sermon in Antioch with a German gloss upon it, suiting it to the times, that ran through all Germany in fourteen days, and has not ceased running through all true Protestantism in opposition to the meritoriousness of Phariseeism and Roman Catholicism, and in short all forms of idolatry and paganism.

The results of the preaching in Antioch were the rejection of the Gospel by the Jews, "contradicting and blaspheming;" in consequence, the declaration of a special mission to the Gentiles; thereupon the conversion of as many as were disposed to eternal life (Variorum Bible, Variorum rendering), accompanied with joy and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Many times in Luke's history the marvels of Paul's mission are left enshrined in few and simple words. We are told for instance (xiv. 1) that Paul and Barnabas went into the synagogue of Iconium and so spake that "a great multitude both of the Jews and also of the Greeks believed." Later we are told, quite incidentally, as it would seem (vs. 21-24), that a

church was organized in that city, and that elders or bishops were appointed over it. All this is written down with no expressions of astonishment. It seems that the faith of the ancient Christians was such that they were no more surprised at conversions and the organization of churches, even in those densely pagan lands, than we are at the growing trees and the fruits in an orchard. When Christ was presented the cause was there; the effects were a matter of consequence.

In Iconium, however, persecutions arose, they, too, being a matter of consequence, and written down with equal calmness. Having tarried "a long time" in that city, the apostles finally, when an assault was made, fled to Lystra and Derbe, cities far in the interior of Lycaonia, or Wolf-land.

In Lystra the Apostle Paul wrought the miracle of healing upon the lame man. He and Barnabas were immediately taken by the shallow and impulsive idolaters of the city for their tutelar deities; Barnabas for Jupiter, he no doubt making the better personal appearance; and Paul for Mercurius, he being the chief speaker, and apparently the servant of Barnabas, the greater god. Oxen and garlands were brought to the door of the house where they were staying, and they would have been worshiped with a sacrifice, had they not rebuked the people with every demonstration of disapproval and horror, rending their clothes, and running in among them, declaring themselves as "men of like passions," and preaching to them the vanities of idolatry, and the

claims of the true God "who made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that are therein." The fickle people were restrained from worshiping them, but now, being disillusioned, they were open to the advances of Paul's enemies. Persuaded by "certain Jews who came from Antioch and Iconium," they who yesterday would have worshiped Paul, to-day stone him and leave him for dead. "The missionary of the cross," it has been said, "is absolutely immortal till his work is done." As Christ viewed it, as the Holy Spirit viewed it, Paul's work was not done, and he was not dead. While they stood round him, he rose up, and presently he went with them into the city. The next day he and Barnabas went to Derbe, where they made many disciples (Variorum Bible), and from which they returned by the way of Lystra, and Iconium, and Antioch, "confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God."

Verse twenty-three of chapter fourteen, should be noted for its bearing upon the primary steps in the organization of the Pauline churches. A plurality of "elders" or "bishops" (xx. 28; Titus i. 5 and 7), was "ordained" or "elected" (Variorum rendering) in every city.

Were these apostles heroes? They went directly back to the cities in which they had been persecuted and stoned. They went customarily into the synagogues of their brethren by blood, and preached doc-

trines that they knew to be revolutionary and unpalatable; they hazarded their lives in the defense of their faith, and in the confirmation of their newly-baptized brethren. Admiration for their noble tenacity of purpose, the solicitude of their watch-care, and the tenderness of their love, cannot be kept within small bounds.

Having returned to their home church in Antioch, they gave a missionary rehearsal, the first of which we have any record, unless it be that of the Apostle Peter upon his return from the home of Cornelius. In sending out her chiefest teachers as missionaries, the Antioch Church proved her apostolicity. In gathering together to hear from her missionaries "all that God had done," and "how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles," she proved by her interest that her spirit was the spirit of Him who died for all men. And still, as of old, the church that is truly apostolic speeds away the representatives of Christ and herself to far-off lands, and welcomes also her returning missionaries, and hears with joy the story of their achievements. Forever and forever, the church that intelligently and truthfully calls herself apostolic must hear and heed the command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel." And forever, except for such obedience, the true church must realize the blasphemy of claiming the promise, "Lo, I am with you always."

X.

THE FIRST CHURCH COUNCIL

"This little picture marks the beginning of Christian liberty. A wrong step here, and Christian liberty would have been lost. Paul was raised up at the very moment of time. He who made havoc of the church kept it together; it was an arm terrific;—whether to strike or to build its energy was superhuman. Paul enlightened the whole church—even James himself became almost a poet under the inspiration of this new voice."—*Joseph Parker.*

X.

THE FIRST CHURCH COUNCIL.

"The apostles and elders and brethren (in other words, the whole church, see verse 22) send greeting unto the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia; Forasmuch as we have learned that certain who went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls; to whom we gave no such commandment; it seemed good unto us, having come to one accord, to choose out men and send unto you, with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent, therefore, Judas and Silas, who themselves also shall tell you the same things by word of mouth. For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: that ye abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, it shall be well with you. Fare ye well."—*Acts xv. 23-29.*

NEANDER calls this the first public document of the Christian church. It is the expression of a victory and a compromise. To appreciate the victory it is necessary to remember that there was a party of the circumcision, Judaizers, Pharisee saints, in the Jerusalem church. When the Apostle Peter returned from Cæsarea after the conversion of Cornelius, "They that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised and didst eat with them." This phrase, "They that were of the circumcision," is Luke's gentle designation of the party. All the

members of the Jerusalem church were circumcised, but they were not all champions of circumcision as a condition of salvation. For the time being these partisans were silenced by Peter's statement of the case, and especially by his argument based upon the fact that the Holy Spirit had been given to Cornelius and his household. But they were the professional heresy-hunters of the church, and, like all such characters, they evidently felt that to them was committed the keeping of the faith, and that they must "contend earnestly for it." They were silenced, but only for a season. Biding their time, they at last hit upon the supreme opportunity for mischief-making in the Gentile church in Antioch. They went down, presumably with authority from the apostles, and said, "Except ye be circumcised, after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved" (xv. 1).

It was a square issue, for Paul and Barnabas had been teaching otherwise. Was Christianity to be the religion of mankind, or was it to settle back into an ethnic cult, a scarcely improved form of Mosaism, a new patch on the old garment, with "rents made worse?" It was the old, old question that we have constantly to face, the question between men of the letter and men of the spirit; the question between stagnation and progress, between formalism and freedom, between legalism and love. And further, it was a question between era and era in history; between dispensation and dispensation in the providence of God; and finally, between the prophets

of God speaking with a transient voice, and the Son of God, who is the Alpha and Omega, whose yea is yea, and whose nay is nay for evermore.

Surely if ever literalists and legalists had a strong case it was this. Were the thunderings upon Mount Sinai to be forgotten? Were the blessings upon Gerizim and the curses upon Ebal no longer to be courted and dreaded? Were not the Sabbaths of Israel and their passovers and their circumcision to be observed "throughout all their generations?" Was not Moses sent of God? Could the moral law be done away, and was not the ceremonial law done up with it verse by verse? Should the phylacteries upon their door posts and the rolls of their Torah be thrown to the ash pit, and that by men who had no new Torah in their hands, but only a word upon their lips? Was the Holy City to lose her prestige, and was the hated Gerizim after all, or Antioch, or any other place, to become quite as acceptable to Jehovah as the place toward which his people had turned their faces in prayer through many generations? In short, were the chosen people to be no longer the chosen people? and were their sacred places, their sacred books, their sacred days, and their sacred names to go for naught?

And how could Paul meet such appeals to law and custom and prestige except by what would surely seem to his opponents as forced interpretations of passages from the prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah and Hosea; or by an appeal to the fact of Gentile

conversions, with the evident fruits of the Spirit aside from the law, an argument easily depreciated by legalists; or by pleading the supremacy of Jesus, in which case his opponents could readily show to their own satisfaction that Jesus indorsed the authority of Moses, having, as was supposed, lived in conformity to the law of Moses?

It was one of those cases in which the soul of the prophet rises up to the intuitive perception of what is right, and in spite of law and logic says, "You are wrong; the heart also has its logic; the Holy Spirit speaks; here are my facts fronting your syllogisms; what will you do?"

"When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question." In this appeal Jerusalem is recognized, according to Prof. W. M. Ramsay, as "the administrative center of the church." The appeal is appropriate also in view of the claim by the Judaizers that they were commissioned by the apostles (xv. 24). As indicating the urgency of the case, and the baleful influence of the Judaizers, it should be remembered that Peter, when he was in Antioch, was won over by them, and that even Barnabas "was carried away by their dissimulation." Paul alone stood firm. His quick and incisive rebuke had its effect on Peter. "I said to Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew,

livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" (Gal. ii. 14). This happened, according to Prof. Ramsay, before the council in Jerusalem, and not, as most critics suppose, afterward, and the adjustment helps to clear up several hard questions. Every indication therefore is that the Antioch church was disturbed to its very center, and since that church was the mother of Gentile Christianity the whole of the Apostle Paul's movement in behalf of a cosmopolitan faith was endangered.

To Paul the period of waiting for the decision of the council must have been a season of anxiety. Should the case go against him it involved one of two consequences, either a schism in the church, or a shrinking back of the Faith from her youth and vigor and expansion like an old and lifeless wine into an old and worthless skin. "Paul would rather have died," says Farrar, "would rather have suffered a schism between the Church of Jerusalem and the churches of her Gentile converts, than admit that there could be no salvation out of the pale of Mosaism. . . . He intended, at all costs, by almost unlimited concessions in the case of individuals (referring to the circumcision of Timothy and Titus), by unflinching resistance when principles were endangered, to establish, as far at any rate as the Gentiles were concerned, the truth that Christ had obliterated the handwriting in force against us,

and had taken it out of the way, nailing the torn fragments of its decrees to his cross."

The debate came on, and there was "much disputing." The "false brethren" were there with every advantage of local associations, national prejudices, centuries of history, the written law with its positive injunctions for all generations, and, more than likely, with warnings of persecution from without should a word be spoken against the law of Moses or their Holy Place. But the Apostle Peter rose up, and true to his Pentecost courage and inspiration repeated his experiences in Cæsarea ten years before. He appealed to the witness of the Holy Spirit on that occasion in the acceptance of the Gentiles, and challenged them to put a yoke upon the neck of the Gentiles, which, he said, "neither we nor our fathers were able to bear." Thereupon, in true Pauline style, he declared that the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ is the only ground of salvation for Jews and Gentiles. There were times when Jesus spoke in such a fashion that no man answered him a word, and the Apostle Peter seems to have learned from the Master something of that power of speech which leaves an opponent unmasked and nonplused. "Then all the multitude kept silence," till at last Barnabas and Paul rose, "declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them." Thus were the hard and fast theologians of the day, the men with an *a priori* creed, cast iron, and all but the "anathema sit" to

it, the men rooted and grounded in their grandfathers' ways, thoroughly honest, thoroughly logical, thoroughly stubborn, the typical, self-appointed conservators of the faith, the anti-progressives, knife in hand—thus were they smitten with facts. Peter and Paul and Barnabas united in putting Cæsarea and Antioch and Derbe and Lystra and Iconium over against Mount Sinai. In all these places God had spoken through the Holy Spirit, receiving the Gentiles, no knife in hand. Traditional prejudice must give way to received practice; *a priori* theories to the logic of facts; God's ancient law engraved on stone to his latest word written upon fleshly tables of the heart; the carnal to the spiritual, shadow to substance, type to anti-type. Peter and Paul and Barnabas pursued the inductive method, collating facts, treating them as legal tender, and upon them basing conclusions, thus anticipating the Baconian method by sixteen centuries. They were the three mighty Protestants of the ancient church.

Last of all James spoke. He was the most interesting figure in the council. As "the brother of the Lord," he would be looked upon with loving reverence; as the bishop of the church in Jerusalem, his word would be final, not as dictatorial but as representative; as a man of extreme holiness, he would be honored by all parties. "Tradition," says Farrar, "as embodied in an Ebionite romance, represents him as wearing no wool, but clothed in fine white linen from head to foot, and—either from some

priestly element in his genealogy, or to symbolize his episcopate in Jerusalem—as wearing on his forehead the petalon, or golden plate of high priesthood. It is said that he was so holy and so highly esteemed by the whole Jewish people that he alone was allowed, like the high priest, to enter the Holy Place; that he lived a celibate and ascetic life; that he spent long hours alone in the temple praying for the people, till his knees became hard and callous like those of a camel; that he had the power of working miracles; that rain fell in accordance with his prayers; that it was owing to his prayers that God's impending wrath was averted from the nation; that he received the title of 'The Just,' and 'Rampart of the People,' and that he was shadowed forth in the images of the prophets."

Such was the traditional man, perhaps not very unlike the real man, who now rose to speak. Having first commanded a hearing, he indorsed the speech that Peter had just made, fortifying it with a prophecy from Amos, quoted from the Septuagint, and declaring that the reception of the Gentiles, recently wrought by the Holy Spirit through Peter and Paul and Barnabas, was in the plans of God from the beginning. Whereupon he gave his sentence that the Gentiles should not be troubled, that is, by the Judaizers, but that they should be exhorted to abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood. The last sentence of this speech (verse 21) contains

a double argument for the proposed compromise. First, because Moses was read in the synagogue every Sabbath the Jews need not fear for the law; the apostles to the Gentiles were not interfering with this arrangement; secondly, because this was the case the Gentiles should be the more ready to abstain from these, to the Jews, most shocking things. That fornication and idolatry should be coupled together seems inevitable when it is remembered that much of the pagan worship was accompanied with the vilest orgies; that the worship of Venus under various forms and names was widespread, and that in Cyprus, the ancient center of her worship, the pollutions accompanying it became a scandal even to the surrounding pagan countries. The thing here condemned as a sin both by the legal and instinctive purity of Judaism, coupled with Christian sanctions, was in all that pagan world "so completely a matter of indifference that Socrates has no censure for it, and Cicero declares that no pagan moralist ever dreamed of meeting it with an absolute prohibition." Here is one of the great secrets of both Jewish and Christian antagonism to idolatry, and the modern Parliaments of Religion that cover up or condone the same pollutions existing rampant in the Buddhistic and Brahmanistic cults of this day, will probably not get very far on the road toward harmonizing the ancient Hebrew purity, still cardinal in Christianity, with the ancient idolatrous impurity, still a factor of pagan worship.

"The apostles and elders and the whole church" agreed to the compromise proposed by James, and wrote to the Gentiles in Antioch a delightfully fraternal letter, and sent it by the hands of Barnabas and Paul, accompanied by two of their own chief men, Judas and Silas, who were instructed to teach the same things by word of mouth, which, being prophets, they did with much exhortation. When the letter was read to the Christians of Antioch, they "rejoiced for the consolation."

Four points are to be noted: First, The decision was a triumph for the Apostle Paul and his co-workers. They could now go out into the Gentile world and preach the Gospel as free from the fetters of legalism as though they were presenting mathematical axioms. It is true that the great apostle was followed and troubled by Judaizers as long as he lived, but they could never again claim the authority of the Jerusalem church. As this Judaizing party was the occasion of the first church council, and consequently of the first document of the Christian church, so by its persistence it occasioned the major part of the literature that we owe to the Apostle Paul. Galatians and Romans cannot be understood aside from this controversy. It appears also in First and Second Corinthians, and in Ephesians, and Colossians, and Philippians, and First Thessalonians. To the end this great man remained true to the trust that Christ had committed to him, as to a "chosen vessel," the trust of Gospel truth and Gospel love

and Gospel liberty; and when he penned his farewell to Timothy he had two things upon which justly to congratulate himself—he had "fought a good fight" (with Judaizers, no doubt), and he had kept "the faith."

Secondly, The decision, like most compromises, was but a temporary settlement of the dispute. De Pressensé, quoted by Prof. B. A. Hinsdale, says: "The barrier was lowered, not removed. Thus, no sooner was the decision communicated, than it received various interpretations. Paul drew from it inferences which were undoubtedly by implication contained in it, but which were not equally evident to the minds of all." Several questions of importance were not touched upon in the decision; the relation of the Jewish Christians themselves to the Mosaic law was very prudently left in abeyance; likewise the social relations of Jewish and Gentile Christians; these and some other questions, such as the release of all Christians from the Jewish altar worship, and cleansings, and fasts, and Sabbaths, were left to be wrought out for us by the Apostle Paul's incisive distinctions between Moses and Christ, between the law and the Gospel, the former as preparatory and temporary, the latter as all-sufficient and final. The tenacity of the Judaizing party for the law of their fathers is most pathetic. Spite of the decision of the council, and the sanction of the Holy Spirit in the reception of Gentiles, and Christ's formally declared supremacy, they could not seem to get over

their fondness for the letter of the law. God's final warnings to them in the utter destruction of Jerusalem, and the temple, and the altar forms of worship there, were unheeded. They continued their opposition to the progressive forms of the faith until they fell logically into the heresy of denying the divine nature of Jesus; they branded the Apostle Paul as a heretic, and became themselves the Ebionite sectarians of the first and second centuries, and dwindled by the middle of the latter century into insignificance.

Thirdly, This council was thoroughly democratic. Grant that the reading "and brethren," in the twenty-third verse is a corruption; yet the democratic character of the council is shown by the twenty-second verse, which reads: "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas." No one assumed autocratic authority. Even Peter is designated in the speech of James by his old, unapostolic name, Simeon. Perhaps it is for these reasons that Farrar contends that the council was not a council at all. According to the Anglican and Romish notions of a council as being thoroughly aristocratic, the laity and inferior orders of the clergy not being admitted, this was not a council. But if open debate in the spirit of the Holy Spirit with the right of suffrage extended to all; if a decision arrived at by "the common sense of most;" if, in short, brotherly counsels

and brotherly conclusions constitute a council, this was a council.

Lastly, As the presence of sin magnifies the workings of grace, so the intensity of Judaism magnifies the Christly charity and liberty of the Jerusalem church. Even as a compromise, the decision is wonderful. James and others must have felt that it broke the trend of the centuries. It was revolutionary, and they knew that to the Jews as a nation, it would appear as a denial of the faith of their fathers. It was a reverent and painful slap in the face of tradition. But the Holy Spirit, genius and guide of the new age, was imperious; he demanded this break in the centuries, and to him the church was loyal. This was an hour freighted with destinies, and these men were fitted for the emergency by "the power from on high." How reverently they couch their decision! And what historic majesty there is in it! "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit—and to us!"

XI.

THE FIRST MISSIONARY JOURNEY IN EUROPE

"Where should Paul be studied, loved and venerated if not in England? Are not English Christians in a very special sense his spiritual children? Do they not owe to him the character of their religion, the form of their doctrine, even their principles of religious liberty and civil right? Is not Anglo-Saxon society his work? Does not his spirit pervade the thousand ramifications of English civilization, extending from individual conduct to the highest scientific activity, and from domestic life to political debates in Parliament?"—*Sabatier.*

"All zones are one seed-field,
And one the fostering sky;
Best germs the ripened ages yield
On world-wide pinions fly."—*Joseph Cook.*

XI.

THE FIRST MISSIONARY JOURNEY IN EUROPE.

"And a vision appeared to Paul in the night; There stood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, saying, Come over into Macedonia and help us."—*Acts xvi. 9.*

This vision has the strangeness of romance, the sternness of history, and the pathos of prayer. It is the way by which the Holy Spirit signifies to Paul that he has been appointed as the actor in a new march of events. The waves of Gospel influence must be kept rolling outward, and this is the signal for an advance. Jerusalem, Judæa, Samaria, the uttermost parts of the earth (Acts i. 8)—that is the Savior's programme; and the Apostle Paul, guided by the Holy Spirit, has now the primacy in carrying it out. Peter is not again named in Acts; Jerusalem has already become second to Antioch; the work of Barnabas even, is left in obscurity, and the historian deals only with this foremost man upon the foremost confines of the pagan world.

Twice the Holy Spirit interfered with Paul's plans before the directing vision was granted him. When he had "made a missionary progress" throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, he evidently desired to preach in "Asia," but the Holy Spirit forbade him (ch. xvi. 6). Then he wanted to go

into Bithynia, "and the Spirit suffered him not." So passing through Mysia, and at the same time passing it by, he came down to Troas. Paul's traveling companions at this time were Silas, who accompanied him from the home church in Antioch, and Timothy, a son in the Gospel, whose home was in Lystra, whose mother was a Jewess, whose father was a Greek, and whom Paul circumcised, not as a matter of compulsion but of concession.

At Troas, however, a third companion announces his presence in the briefest and least pretentious of all imaginable ways. He simply says "we" (xvi. 10)—, and then goes on writing about the whole company. In this way the writer of Acts identifies himself with the history he relates. Paul is his hero, and he but the humblest of fellow-workers. It is a shrewd and very interesting guess of Prof. Ramsay's, that Luke was a Macedonian; that being a physician he had come to Troas on business; that through professional services he became acquainted with Paul, and was converted; that he himself was the "man of Macedonia" whom Paul saw in a vision; that Philippi was his home, and that he was Paul's first host and helper in this, the first city in that part of Macedonia.

The Apostle Paul's voyage across the Ægean Sea must have seemed to him like a progress merely from province to province. All that world was Rome, and all these provinces were hers. But as we see it his voyage was from continent to continent, so does the

perspective of centuries enlarge rather than diminish the plans of Providence. The following paragraph, from an eloquent lecture by Joseph Cook, will help us to seize upon the historic significance of the call of the "man from Macedonia:"

"Before the battles of Marathon and Salamis, Asia predominated in the world's affairs. Since those contests she has always held a second rank. This steel-gray narrow sheet of murmurous salt water has been thus visibly touched in human history by that finger at whose contact the hills melt and the mountains smoke; and, therefore, even after 2,300 years the waves flash here, between the bleak, rocky shores, with a light better than that of the sun. Greek civilization, on that great day when the women on Salamis, according to the prophecy, boiled their meat with broken oars, was in process of preservation for you and me. And among the corpses which shut out the moonlight from the depths of this clear water on the night after the battle, the plans of Providence for the education of Rome, of London, of Paris, and of Boston were advancing."

Troas and Neapolis, therefore, are only dots on the map; in the larger sense, quite literally, the Apostle Paul set sail from Asia and landed in Europe, and the ship that bore him carried a more precious freight by far than was ever borne by the fleets and transports of Xerxes, or Philip of Macedon, or Alexander, or any of the Cæsars. Beyond Macedonia was Rome; and beyond Rome, Germany; and beyond

Germany, Britain; and beyond Britain, America; and still beyond America, an Asia that was not in the dreams even of the greatest of the Cæsars. And toward all these nations the face of Paul was turned, though he knew it not; and through him westward the Gospel was destined to take its course, guiding and inspiring the course of empire, till it should encompass the earth. What mighty works were yet to be wrought by Greece and Rome, and by the barbarians that Cæsar presumed to have conquered! What battles and victories! What governments, civilizations, progress! What mistakes, sorrows, revolutions and triumphs, both of war and peace! And the "man of Macedon" uttered the cry of deepest need, and the pathetic prayer of all these "kindreds and tongues and peoples and nations" through their centuries of struggle when he said to the missionary of the cross, "Come over and help us."

It was an ancient custom of the Jews to meet by a river side for prayer when no synagogue was at hand. One of the exiles of the great captivity sang:

> "By the rivers of Babylon,
> There we sat down, yea we wept
> When we remembered Zion;
> We hanged our harps upon the willows in the midst thereof;
> For there they that carried us away captive,
> Required of us mirth, saying,
> Sing us one of the songs of Zion."

Finding, as it would seem, no synagogue in the city of Philippi, Paul and Luke, therefore, on the Sabbath sought the customary place of prayer by the

river. There they found Lydia, "a seller of purple," and her household, worshiping God. The Lord opened her heart; she attended to the things that Paul spoke; she was baptized, and her household. Luke's record of this first conversion in Europe (xvi. 14, 15) is precise, unadorned, and beautiful. It is his style to state facts; he seeks little from the arts of rhetoric; but here in the statement of the fact he produces a picture, and the circumstances and the associations unite in giving to it the character and the sacredness of an ancient masterpiece. There is no incompleteness about it. There is the place and the spirit of prayer; there is the preacher and his audience; there is the declaration of the Gospel and its confession in baptism; there is the sisterly hospitality that springs from gratitude for the gift of faith and hope and love. And all this is set within the somber background of Greek and Roman history. The city was named for Philip, the father of Alexander the Great, and was a monument of his empire. A hundred and sixty-eight years before Christ it fell into the hands of Rome. Ninety-four years before the visit of Paul, not far from Lydia's place of prayer, occurred the battle of Philippi, which decided the fate of the republic of Rome, and introduced the imperial system. Here Cassius and Brutus committed suicide, the former before, the latter after the battle was lost. But in this humble baptism there was the beginning of a mightier and more beneficent movement for Europe

and the world than could possibly spring from the battlefields of Greece and Rome. One cannot forbear the reflection that perhaps the nearest approach in modern times, as regards historic interest, to this baptism in the Gangites was that one in the Ganges, when, in the year 1800, on Christmas day, Chrishna Pal confessed in his body, at the hands of William Carey, the death and resurrection of Jesus.

Dr. J. M. Stifler has an interesting suggestion in explanation of Luke's care in describing this conversion: "Since the beginning of a new stage finds record here, we have some repetitions of features seen before. Years have passed away, the Gospel has spread far and wide, but baptism has not been mentioned since the story looked at Peter in the household of Cornelius. When the Gentile work began it was necessary to show that baptism would attend it, but after that mention there is no other till we come to the household of Lydia and the jailer. For here again we are at the center of a new circle."

The same author brings together other parallels that are interesting. "Samaria triumphed over Simon Magus. Paphos left Elymas groping in blindness. The strong man armed is again encountered (referring to ch. xvi. 16-18), only to suffer the spoil of another of his chattels. The meeting of an evil spirit on the entrance of the Gospel into Europe, is in harmony with the cases above cited, is in harmony with the hindrances of divine grace from the dawn of history. Satan blocks the way as soon as it is

entered." This insane slave-girl, ventriloquist and soothsayer, is another example of those numerous "dabblers in the black art" that belong to the times of Paul. Of course her advertisement of Paul and his missionary co-workers as the servants of the most high God, and the preachers of the way of salvation, was such as to bring the sobriety and dignity of the Gospel into disrepute. The triflers of the city must have jeered continually at seeing this crazy girl following the missionaries, and calling after them. At last Paul rebuked the spirit, and healed her. This destroyed her commercial value, and brought down upon him the persecution of her owners, for there were not wanting men so mean as to make speculation out of such maladies, and people so superstitious as to pay the price of such fortune telling. It was easy to call out the mob by shouting that the customs of the Romans were endangered, and the result was that Paul and Silas were beaten and imprisoned. This gave the occasion for the midnight prayer and praise meeting in the prison; the earthquake; the opening of the prison doors; the loosing of the prisoners; the jailer's intention to kill himself, supposing his prisoners were gone; Paul's gracious interference and timely preaching, and the conversion of a household the same hour of the night.

The immersion of the jailer and his household offers no difficulties to scholarly exegetes. "The rite may have been performed," says DeWette, "in the same fountain or tank in which the jailer had

washed them." Meyer, as quoted by Hackett, suggests that the water was in the court of the house; and that the baptism was that of immersion, which, he says, "formed an essential part of the symbolism of the act." The fact that the jailer brought them out of the prison before their baptism and that they did not come into his house till after it had taken place is favorable to immersion rather than affusion, for the latter could most likely have been performed either in the prison or the house, as also the washing of their stripes.

A manly trait in the character of Paul is shown in that he refused to go secretly away bearing the wounds and humiliation of his unjustified whipping. The lictors sent, saying, "Let these men go." "Nay verily," said Paul. "We are Romans; we are uncondemned; they have beaten us; they shall not thrust us out privily; let them come themselves and fetch us out." Paul gloried in necessary sufferings for Christ's sake, and he never murmured at persecutions incurred in the way of duty; but he was a stranger to monkish asceticism, and superstitious trust in the meritoriousness of penances would have been a horror to his transparent soul.

The next church established by Paul was in the city of Thessalonica. This city was named after a sister of Alexander the Great; it was on the direct road from Philippi to Rome; it was situated at the head of the Thermaic Gulf, and has been an important point from Paul's day to our own. To the

apostle this was one of the most satisfactory of all the churches. His first letters were written to it; he comforts the members of it in their persecutions; exhorts them to rejoice unceasingly; assures them of his deep love, and while praying for them, craves their prayers.

In Berea the apostle found exceptional Jews, "more noble than those in Thessalonica," in that they readily received the word, and candidly examined the Scriptures to confirm it. To the great missionary this experience must have been as delightful as it was rare; but the inevitable happened. Malicious Jews from Thessalonica followed him, and again, as usual, he was persecuted and driven out.

Athens has an imperishable charm for the student. It was the birthplace of Greek history and philosophy and rhetoric. Immortal names are associated with it, and the masterpieces of their genius are the admiration of the centuries. "Were Plato, Socrates, and Demosthenes the only forms visible from the Acropolis, that eminence would be the loftiest outlook on the globe over human intellectual history. At the west summit of the Parthenon there is a point from which are visible the groves of Plato's Academy, the daily haunts of Socrates, the Pnyx of Demosthenes, the grounds of the Lyceum of Aristotle, the Mars' Hill of Paul, the Propylea of Phidias and Pericles,—the theatre of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides,—the mountain slope once the seat of Xerxes,—the path to Marathon of Miltiades, and the Salamis

straits of Aristides and Themistocles." In the time of Paul Athens was the home of philosophy and frivolity, of art and idolatry. Petronius says it was more easy to meet a god than a man in Athens. "There were more statues in Athens than in all the rest of Greece put together." All this would be the more displeasing to Paul since he was trained in a school that prohibited the representation in art of the human form. And besides, the conventional nudity of Grecian art must have seemed a shocking degradation to the severely chaste and lofty morals of the Hebrew missionary. "It is all very well," says Farrar, "for sentimentalists to sigh over 'the beauty that was Greece, and the glory that was Rome;' but paganism had a very ragged edge, and it was this that Paul daily witnessed. . . . Perfectness of sculpture might have been impossible without the nude athleticism that ministers to vice. For one who placed the sublimity of manhood in perfect obedience to the moral law, for one to whom purity and self-control were elements of the only supreme ideal, it was in that age impossible to love, impossible to regard even with complacence, an art which was avowedly the handmaid of idolatry, and covertly the patroness of shame. Our regret for the extinguished brilliancy of Athens will be less keen when we bear in mind that more than any other city she has been the corruptress of the world."

Thus Paul confronted art in Athens, while in the persons of the Epicureans and the Stoics he encoun-

tered philosophy. The former were materialistic and therefore practically atheistic; they sought pleasure as the highest good, and descended into the pathways of sensuality in their search. The substance of their beastly teaching is put in a single phrase by Paul in the fifteenth chapter of I. Corinthians, when, upon the supposition that Christianity is false and the dead rise not, he says, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

Considering Stoicism as the noblest of the Greek philosophies, it was nevertheless fatalistic and pantheistic. The Stoics aimed at a laudable self-control, but ended in heartless indifference to the conditions around them, and in the justification of suicide. Of the Christian's Godward trust and manward sympathy they knew nothing, and the trend of their teaching was the direct antithesis of Christian altruism. For four hundred years these systems of thought had been uppermost in Athens, and at last they had degenerated, the one into "the apotheosis of suicide," the other into "the glorification of lust."

From every humane and beneficent standpoint the failure of the philosophy and art of Athens is conspicuous. They had filled the city with idols and idlers; with a university of philosophic triflers, and a population of news-mongers; with voluptuous priests and unknown gods. The best name that such a people could find for so great and serious a soul as Paul was a piece of their street slang; they called him "Spermologus," by which they meant almost

any amount of contempt, a babbler, a seed-picker, "an ignorant plagiarist," a worthless fellow with scraps of learning. However, he had something new to tell them, and so they took hold of him and brought him to the Areopagus, not necessarily to Mars' Hill, but to their highest court, and not for a court trial, but for the sake of curiosity.

In the city of Socrates Paul had adopted the Socratic method; he had gone about the streets engaging this one and that one in conversation. But Athens was also the city of Demosthenes, and the Areopagus demanded of him an oration. By his courtly and undaunted bearing he plainly said in the presence of these degenerate descendants of great thinkers, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ." We know that the orations of Demosthenes *have* lived; we know that this sermon of Paul's *will* live. The grouping of his thoughts, the delicacy and daring of his polemics, and the novelty of his theme must have been alike startling to his Athenian auditors, as they are the admiration of his latest readers. The tact and dignity of his introduction are spoiled by the King James translators, for Paul would not have insulted an Athenian audience to begin with by calling them superstitious. Such bluntness and bungling would not be in keeping with his genteel rule of "becoming all things to all men that he might by all means save some."

This, rather, is his introduction: "Men of Athens, I perceive that you carry your religious reverence

very far, for as I passed by I beheld an altar with this inscription, To an Unknown God. What therefore ye worship in ignorance, this set I forth unto you."

Having seized this text from one of their own altars, he seized also a quotation from one of their own poets, and upon this double basis chosen in common with them he declared that the God confessedly unknown to them is Creator and Father, indirectly rebuking in this double proposition the pantheism of the Stoics, the practical atheism of the Epicureans, the polytheism of the people, and the pride of caste and race that belonged to every Greek. He made the search for God the object of existence, thus rebuking their contention that pleasure is the highest good. By making the worship of God a matter not of the hands but of the heart of the devotee he rebuked the meritoriousness of their sacrificial cult. By deducing the idea of the Godhead from that of the Fatherhood of God he rebuked a whole city full of idols, saying, we ought not to think that what is divine is like unto gold or silver or stone graven by art or man's device. In conclusion he made a direct application, calling upon them to repent, and warning them of the righteous judgment of God; and all in all, both warning and pleading were based upon the fact of the resurrection of Jesus from the dead.

At this the more frivolous mocked, and the more seemingly sober said, Felix-like, "We will hear thee again of this matter."

One Areopagite believed, Dionysius by name; and one woman, Damaris by name. Was this then the result of Paul's mission to Athens, "The eye of Greece," "The pride of the world?" A city full of babblers mistaking Paul for a babbler! One is reminded of Carlyle's fable, adopted from the Koran, of men turned to apes, and "gibbering very genuine nonsense, there by the Dead Sea." But this was not the whole result. Could Paul have foreseen the church that afterwards grew up in Athens; the vanishing of her gods as though smitten by magic; the giving of her sons and daughters in Christian martyrdom; and the bishops that were trained in her Christian schools, he would not have gone so sadly away, and we can imagine him exclaiming in anticipated triumph, "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are; that no flesh should glory in his presence."

With fine rhetoric, but with pagan rather than Christian taste, Renan has apostrophized the smitten idols of Athens; "Ah, beautiful and chaste images; true gods and goddesses, tremble! See the man who will raise the hammer against you. The fatal word has been pronounced; you are idols. The mistake of this ugly little Jew will be your death warrant." With vastly finer rhetoric, and with iner-

rant Christian taste, Mrs. Browning has sung their requiem:

"Gods of Hellas! gods of Hellas!
Can ye listen in your silence?
Can your mystic voices tell us
Where ye hide? In floating islands,
With a wind that evermore
Keeps you out of sight of shore?
Pan, Pan is dead.

"O twelve gods of Plato's vision,
Crowned to starry wanderings,—
With your chariots in procession,
And your silver clash of wings!
Very pale ye seem to rise,
Ghosts of Grecian deities—
Now Pan is dead!

"Gods! we vainly do adjure you,—
Ye return nor voice nor sign;
Not a votary could secure you
Even a grave for your Divine!
Not a grave to show thereby,
Here these gray old gods do lie!
Pan, Pan is dead."

Corinth was a city of four hundred thousand people when Paul visited it. A hundred and forty-six years before Christ the Romans had destroyed it; but in forty-four before Christ, Julius Cæsar, marking the importance of its situation, had rebuilt it and colonized it. Lying on the highway of travel and commerce between the East and the West, it sprang into prominence with surprising rapidity, and became "The Vanity Fair of the Roman Empire, at once the London and the Paris of the first century after

Christ." Its wealth and its profligacy were proverbial, and to its nameless and more degrading vices were given by the worship of Venus, the sanctions of religion. It had all the traits of a city suddenly grown. There were the ugly contrasts between the poor, housed in their ancients huts of wood or straw, and the rich adventurers of yesterday dwelling in palaces adorned with relics from the ancient city, and displaying the inevitable arrogance and shallow culture of such upstarts. Side by side with the sober business man of means, there came the huckster and the trickster, and together with the commerce of the nations there came the gods of the nations with their devotees, their unsavory priests, and their prostitute priestesses. Such a city is a great catch-all. Farrar says, "It was in the midst of this mongrel and heterogeneous population of Greek adventurers and Roman bourgeois, with a tainting infusion of Phœnicians—this mass of Jews, ex-soldiers, philosophers, merchants, sailors, freedmen, slaves, tradespeople, hucksters, and agents of every form of vice—a colony without aristocracy, without traditions, without well-established citizens—that the toil-worn Jewish wanderer made his way."

In Corinth the Apostle Paul met Aquila and Priscilla, Jews, lately driven from Rome by an edict of the Emperor Claudius. One cannot but muse upon these three wandering and persecuted people establishing a home and working together at their common trade of tent-making. Perhaps they first met

in the synagogue, for there it was not unusual for craftsmen to sit together, "silversmiths by themselves, and ironworkers by themselves, and miners by themselves, and weavers by themselves, and when a poor man came there he recognized the members of his craft, and went there, and from thence was his support, and that of the members of his house." Whether in the synagogue, or the home, or the prison, Paul was a persistent and tireless missionary. These household companions could not live with him long without hearing of the Savior. They became thoroughly instructed Christians, and accompanied him to Ephesus, and théir friendship lasted as long as Paul lived. At a later date, in Ephesus Aquila and Priscilla found Apollos, an eloquent Alexandrian and disciple of John the Baptist, and having instructed him perfectly in the way of the Gospel, sent him as a preacher to the church in Corinth. In Rome at a later date they had a church in their house. And still later, once more in Ephesus, they received through Timothy Paul's last earthly greetings.

In Corinth Paul was persecuted as usual by the Jews. The incarnate malice that nailed Jesus to the cross never deserted this foremost herald of the cross. In Jerusalem, in Pisidian Antioch, in Iconium, in Lystra, in Thessalonica, in Berea, in Corinth, he was "in perils by his own countrymen." Such persistent malice would have discouraged or soured the spirit of all but the most robust and saintly of

saints. His strength came from an unseen source, and receiving mercy he fainted not. Two things happened in Corinth to comfort him and to prolong his stay. In a time of deepest need, the Lord stood by him in the night, and said to him, "Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace. For I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee; for I have much people in this city" (xviii. 9-11). "*I am with thee.*" Sustained by such companionship, he continued a year and six months teaching the word of God in Corinth.

Then befell to his advantage one of those unique incidents which are capable of letting us so far into the spirit of the times. The Jews attempted an accusation of Paul at the judgment seat of Gallio. Seneca the philosopher was brother to this noble Roman, and said of him: "Those who love him best don't love him enough;" and also, "No mortal is so sweet to any single person as he is to all mankind." He was the perfection of kindliness, courtliness and nobility. After his proconsulship in Corinth he attained to the consulship, and there is a tradition that he was murdered by Nero. So far as concerns our present study, he stands as the representative of the Roman policy at that time in respect to the Jews of the provinces, evidently considering Christianity as a phase of Judaism. Looking with the undisguised contempt of the typical Roman ruler upon everything pertaining to the Jews, he drove them from his judgment-seat when they came

dragging Paul before him, refusing to be a judge of questions of *their* law. Perhaps Gallio would have cared as little had they beaten Paul instead of Sosthenes. He simply declined to be troubled by them. Perhaps the Greeks joined the proconsul in his contempt for the Jews, and may be Paul had won some friends among them. But at any rate the nonchalance of Gallio and the prankishness of the Greeks, put a sudden stop to the persecution of Paul "by his own countrymen," and made it possible for him to stay "yet a good while" in Corinth, so that "many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed, and were baptized."

So far as Luke's record goes, the pioneer missionary work of the Apostle Paul may be fairly said to have ended at Corinth. Upon his third journey he did a great and fruitful work, but it was mainly if not wholly within the regions covered by the first and second journeys. In Rome he was a prisoner rather than a pioneer, and besides, others had preceded him as preachers in that city. In the spring of 53, he set sail from Corinth for Syria, that he might attend the Passover of that year in Jerusalem. "And when he had landed at Cæsarea, and gone up and saluted the church, he went down to Antioch."

Was he coldly received in Jerusalem? Why did he hasten away to Antioch? Had Paul's position as regards the law caused James and the elders to recoil from him? Why was there no gathering of the church to receive him as upon a former, and also

upon a later, occasion? The silence of Luke throws a veil over much. But knowing the Jews we can judge much.

Once again, and once only, at the close of his third missionary journey, he visited Jerusalem, saying, "I go bound in the spirit to Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there; save that the Holy Spirit witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me. But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God."

XII.

PAUL'S FIRST IMPRISONMENT IN ROME

"Not only did Paul conquer the pagan world for Jesus Christ; he accomplished a task no less necessary, and perhaps more difficult, in emancipating at the same time infant Christianity from Judaism, under whose guardianship it was in danger of being stifled. Besides removing the center of gravity of the new church, the advance of his mission from Jerusalem to Antioch, from Antioch to Ephesus, and from Ephesus to Rome, he also succeeded in disengaging from the swaddling-bands of Judaism the spiritual and moral principles which constitute Christianity a progressive and universal religion." —*Sabatier.*

XII.

PAUL'S FIRST IMPRISONMENT IN ROME.

"I am standing at Cæsar's judgment seat."—*Acts xxv. 10.*

THUS Paul appealed from his Jewish brethren to a pagan court, and the greatest of Christian missionaries placed himself before the highest of political tribunals. Two years before he had entered Jerusalem "bound in the spirit," saying, "I know not the things that shall befall me there;" rescued by Lysias from the murderous intent of his own people, he left the city in the night escorted by a guard of Roman soldiers. Felix found no fault in him, and Festus, successor to Felix in A. D. 60, found no fault in him. When the latter proposed to release him from all claims of Roman law on condition that he would go back to Jerusalem to be tried by the Jews, he, knowing his rights as a Roman citizen, and dreading Cæsar, though that Cæsar chanced to be Nero, less than the Sanhedrin, made the memorable appeal under which at last he reached Rome. By the appeal he gained the continued protection of the Roman authorities against the Jews, who, "or ever he came near," were ready to kill him. By it also he was enabled to carry out his long cherished plan of visiting Rome (xix. 21). It mattered little to him that he should be carried there in chains, for he

knew how to ennoble a chain, and turn its very clanking into an eloquence that should speak for him of the "hope of Israel." Others might be ashamed of his chain, he was not. From it he took the title, "Bond servant of Jesus Christ," a title nobler far than any mere fragment of alphabetism that is made to adorn or desecrate the names of men. Under this title he proceeded to Rome, and this was the title he wore while he was the imprisoned primate of the church in Rome. It has fallen to the lot of his degenerate non-apostolic successors of later ages to deck themselves in various combinations of ecclesiastical capital letters, always with corresponding millinery, and strut about the "Holy City." He, as lief as not, would enter the city of the Cæsars, make the acquaintance of Cæsar's household, and appear before the reigning Cæsar, bound like a culprit to a soldier of the Cæsars.

Perhaps he saw in this the only possible way of appearing before the highest potentate on earth, for how else than as a prisoner demanding his legal rights as a Roman could a despised Jew get himself before the Emperor of the world! How else could he gain the opportunity of turning for one brief hour the court of the Empire into a pulpit, and the throne of the Cæsars into a pew while he preached Christ crucified! Did Paul ever appear before Nero in person, and did he reason of righteousness, temperance, and the judgment to come, as in the presence of Felix? And was there in that degenerate Cæsar,

that malformed specimen of human kind, still left enough of humanity to tremble, as Felix did? Luke's history ends suddenly, and there is much that we shall never know, but the possibility of such a meeting between the noblest and the ignoblest of men, the former in chains, the latter on a throne, is a spur to the imagination.

By his appeal to Cæsar, and his consequent trial in Rome, Paul gained, or at least planned, a test case in the supreme court of his day. He must have foreseen that general persecutions would arise, instigated by Jews and pagans alike, if the sanctions of the Empire were not obtained for the growing faith. He could reason thus: I appeal to Cæsar; should I be acquitted, Christianity will then stand as a *religio licita*, and Christians throughout the Empire can then claim the protection of Rome. This supposition ennobles his appeal from a mere matter of personal self-defense to a far-seeing and definitely planned defense of all Christians.

It should be noted that the last eight chapters of the book of Acts are devoted almost exclusively to Paul's connection with Roman officials. A tribune with his cohort of soldiers saved him from the mob, and led him to the tower of Antonia, from the steps of which he was permitted to make his defense to his own people in Hebrew. When certain Jews swore by their lives that they would kill him, Claudius Lysias sent him under guard to Felix. Felix protected him, heard him, and trembled, and turned

him over after two years to Festus. Festus also protected him, declined to take him to Jerusalem for trial, granted his appeal to Cæsar, and permitted him to speak before Agrippa. Julius the centurion, his guardian on the well-nigh disastrous voyage to Rome, "entreated him courteously," permitted him to visit his friends in Sidon, and took him into his counsels during the voyage. On the island of Melita, Publius and others "honored him with many honors." At Puteoli his Roman guard permitted him to tarry seven days with Christian brethren. At Rome he was suffered "to dwell by himself, with a soldier that kept him."

It is an attractive theory of Prof. Ramsay's, that Luke wrote his books, the Gospel and the Acts, the former a little before, and the latter a little later than, the year 80; that at that time there was a growing tendency in the Empire to persecute Christians because they were Christians; that, therefore, Luke had a well defined purpose in dwelling so at length upon the relations of Paul to the Empire, namely, to show that in his day Christians could not be condemned on the charge of being Christians, but only, like other citizens, upon criminal charges; that it was his intention to write a third book in which to set forth Paul's trial and release, and later ministry; that the completion of his plan would have been the completion of his plea for Christianity as a *religio licita*, and that the work in full was to be addressed, as the Gospel and the Acts certainly are, to a Roman

officer, whose baptismal name was Theophilus. In these sentences but the barest outline of the theory is given, and the reader must be referred to Prof. Ramsay's work for its complete statement and argumentation. Like most theories, it explains some things, raises some questions that it does not settle, and leaves some of the old problems without solution. If the late date assigned be accepted, one immediately wonders why then there should be neither in the Gospel nor in the Acts any reference to the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70; why nothing is said about the Neronian persecutions, and why there should be no hint of the heretical tendencies that were troubling the church late in the century. The supposition of an intended third book, which Luke was not permitted to finish, weighs in a measure against these objections, and also explains the abrupt ending of the Acts. In the main, the theory seems credible, and it is at least worthy of careful consideration.

Luke's description of the voyage from Cæsarea to Rome must be that of one who made the trip. It is not fiction. The course of the voyage has been retraced point by point; harbors, such as Fair Havens and St. Paul's Bay, have been visited and identified, and even the soundings recorded by Luke have been verified, and no pains have been spared to test the accuracy of the record. The vividness and precision of the account are such, the exactness of the soundings and of the specified days and nights

and hours is such, that Luke is supposed to have kept while on board a diary, with the help of which at a later date he framed the history. Prof. Ramsay says, "The account of the voyage as a whole is commonly accepted by critics as the most trustworthy part of the Acts, and as one of the most instructive documents for the knowledge of ancient seamanship." We should be aware that the hyper-higher-critics have tried their hands upon this chapter. They have discovered in the "sections" vv. 21-26 and vv. 33-35 a better role and a higher character attributed to Paul than in vv. 10 and 31, and they have forthwith concluded that these "sections" are the interpolations of a later writer, who sought to throw around Paul the halo of a mythical heroism. It is interesting therefore to know the opinion of the latest great specialist in this field. Prof. Ramsay says:

"But let us cut out every verse that puts Paul on a higher plane, and observe the narrative that would result: Paul twice comes forward with advice that is cautiously prudent, and shows a keen regard to the chances of safety. If that is all the character he displayed throughout the voyage, why do we study the man and his fate? All experience shows that in such a situation there is often found some one to encourage the rest; and if Paul had not been the man to comfort and cheer his despairing shipmates, he would never have impressed himself on history or made himself an interest to all succeeding times.

The world's history stamps the interpolation theory here as false. . . . It would cut out the center of the picture. . . . The superhuman element is inextricably involved in this book; you cannot cut it out by any critical process that will bear scrutiny. You must take all or leave all."

Rome when Paul visited it was a city of two millions of people, the cullings, good, bad, and indifferent, from every nation under heaven. Conqueror and conquered, master and slave, soldier and citizen, Greeks, Jews, all sorts of barbarians, kinky-haired Africans, blue-eyed Germans, matrons as noble and chaste as the mother of the Gracchi, matrons who counted their age by the number of husbands they had had, multitudes of priests and prostitutes, armies of gladiators and droves of wild beasts, the immensely rich and the desperately poor, were mingled together in that awful pell-mell of humanity, which had as its hope against starvation the corn ships from Alexandria; as its chiefest amusements, the midnight brawl and the blood-soaked sands of the amphitheater; and as its chief citizen Nero, at once emperor, "priest, atheist, and god." Paul's imprisonment in Rome fell within that period characterized by Gibbon as the iron age, the period that succeeded the peaceful years of Augustus, and that preceded "the golden age of Trajan and the Antinonies." There falls within the purview of New Testament history a group of the successors of Augustus which Gibbon has bunched and branded in the following summary

way. "Their unparalleled vices, and the splendid theater on which they were acted, have saved them from oblivion. The dark, unrelenting Tiberias, the furious Caligula, the feeble Claudius, the profligate and cruel Nero, the beastly Vitellius, and the timid, inhuman Domitian, are condemned to everlasting infamy. During four-score years (excepting only the short and doubtful respite of Vespasian's reign) Rome groaned beneath an unremitting tyranny, which exterminated the ancient families of the republic, and was fatal to almost every virtue and every talent that arose in that unhappy period."

It was Nero's Rome in which Paul was imprisoned. The Rome of which Nero himself grew tired, and which he burned in the fury of his passion to invent a new sensation. Three of its fourteen precincts were utterly destroyed; four only escaped the flames, and in these were the Imperial palaces and gardens. To these gardens the terrified populace thronged, and the monstrous Emperor, to excuse himself, charged the incendiarism on the Christians, and still fertile in the diabolical invention of sensations and spectacles, crucified some; sewed some in the skins of wild animals and thrust them out to the dogs; and others still he steeped in pitch, and thrust them out in blazing tunics to light up the gardens while he played the role of a buffoon and charioteer. This was the beginning of the persecution of Christians as Christians by the Empire, and it happened in the year 64, only four years after Paul entered the city as the

"bond servant of Jesus Christ.' Gibbon has sketched for us one of the transformation scenes of history which in itself is suggestive of many reflections. "The gardens and the circus of Nero on the Vatican, which were polluted with the blood of the first Christians, have been rendered still more famous by the triumph and by the abuse of the persecuted religion. On the same spot a temple which far surpasses the ancient glories of the Capitol has since been erected by the Christian Pontiffs, who, deriving their claim of universal dominion from an humble fisherman of Galilee, have succeeded to the throne of the Cæsars, given laws to the barbarian conquerors of Rome, and extended their spiritual jurisdiction from the coasts of the Baltic to the shores of the Pacific Ocean." So similarly history has its revenges in persons as well as places. While Nero was at the same moment claiming divine honors and outraging all human decency, Paul was preaching to the chance visitors at his home the doctrines which were destined in a few generations to do away forever with the impious honors that paganism was accustomed to pay to its potentates. And in his writings, produced in part during that imprisonment, he has left enshrined the same doctrines, more enduring than the ancient Capitol or the modern Temple, and destined to destroy the superstitious reverence paid by devotees scarcely less than pagan to a spiritual potentate more Romanized than Christianized. To that obscure prisoner more than to any other except the Savior himself was

due the reformation of the Empire in conduct and doctrines, and to him we owe in like manner the very soul and body of the sixteenth century Reformation, and of present century world-wide evangelization. He who, glorying only in the cross of Christ, was so potent to smite the idols of his own day, is still potent, through the kindred souls of Martin Luther and William Carey, to smite the more modern idols of the papacy and of paganism.

Before Paul reached Rome, forty miles out at Appii Forum, and again thirty miles out at Tabernae, he was met by "brethren" from the city, "whom, when Paul saw, he thanked God and took courage." There was already a church in Rome, and at least two years before Paul had addressed to these same brethren his Roman letter. There must have been some who knew him by face. Had Priscilla and Aquila gone back to Asia before Paul reached Rome? Timothy was with him much, and is associated with him in the addresses of the Colossian and Philippian letters, and in that to Philemon. Mark, touchingly mentioned as "sister's son to Barnabas" (Col. iv. 10), was with him, and Aristarchus stayed so constantly with him as to deserve the appellation, "fellow-prisoner." And he had Luke, his "beloved physician," and Epaphras, a "dear fellow-servant," and minister to the church at Colossæ, perhaps a young man, and like Timothy and Titus, a student of Paul,—for did he not have a college in Rome, and a training school for young preachers of the Word?

And another possible student, Demas, who afterward forsook him, "having loved this present world," was with him. And lastly, Tychicus, "a beloved brother and faithful minister of the Lord," by whom the letters to the Colossians and Ephesians were posted, was one of his companions. Ah, that hired house in Rome! Was it not at once the home of the apostle, his hostlery for friends, his pulpit, his professor's chair, and his editorial sanctum,—and his prison? Could we identify that house, could we know that spot, it should rank with Sinai in the sanctity, and higher than Sinai in the potency of the voice that has spoken from it!

It seems that the Jews in Rome had little to do with Paul. We have no assurance that they took part in the proceedings against him. Perhaps they considered prudence the better part of valor. They were a despised people in Rome, and they knew it; Paul was a favored prisoner, and they knew that. When he called them to him three days after his arrival, and laid his case before them, they professed to know nothing about it. They even professed a desire to hear him, for they said with a touch of malice, "As concerning this sect, we know that it is everywhere spoken against." Upon a set day they heard him from morning till evening expounding and testifying, and persuading them, "both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets." As usual, some believed and some did not, and as usual they fell into a violent dispute among themselves. That

Paul was in no mood to curry favor with them, but only to enlighten and persuade and warn them, is shown by his use of Isaiah's terrible anathema, denouncing their hardness and their hopelessness, and by his definitely expressed purpose of devoting himself to the Gentiles (xxviii. 26-28).

It seems also that the Church in Rome was not enthusiastic in its loyalty to Paul. In the last chapter of the letter to the Colossians he names a very few disciples, and says, "These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, which have been a comfort to me." In his second letter to Timothy, he complains bitterly, and with prayers for his deserters, that at his first defense no man stood with him. Judaizers may have influenced some, but more than likely the dread of Nero's fickleness and cruelty rested like a blight upon the souls of all but Paul and the very fewest of his friends.

There are some indications that at this period Paul was not penniless. He did not work at his trade, and he seems not to have depended on alms. He had his own hired house, thus escaping the loathsome prisons of that day. This house could not have been in the poorer quarters of the city, for it must have been easy of access to the soldiers, to one of whom he was chained daily while he was in Cæsarea. Felix communed with him often, courting a bribe from him, which evidently he never received. But the fact indicates that Paul had money at his disposal (ch. xxiv. 26).

In making his appeal to Cæsar, according to Prof. Ramsay, he was entering upon an expensive line of life. We are reminded by the same author that a long lawsuit is expensive; that Roman officials, such as Felix, did not look for small bribes; that "at Cæsarea he was confined to the palace of Herod; but he had to live, to maintain two attendants, and to keep up a respectable appearance;" that he was attended, perhaps at his own expense, by Luke and Aristarchus, who to the Romans would appear as his slaves; and that at Rome, in addition to the expense of "his own hired house," he would be expected to maintain the soldier who guarded him. Prof. Ramsay's solution of this financial phase of the question is pleasing, and it casts a side light on his theory as previously referred to. Concluding that Paul must have been a man of some wealth during these years, he suggests that either he had come into possession of his hereditary property, or if he had previously been disowned by his relatives, a reconciliation had been reached, and his property was put at his disposal. If so, he was using it in defense of the faith, making his own case a test case in the highest of earthly courts. This would be in perfect keeping with the character of the man who could say, "But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I

have suffered all things, and do count them but dross that I may win Christ."

One question remains, that of Paul's acquittal and subsequent labors. Over this Luke has left the veil of his silence. Paul's later epistles are not decisive. It would be worse than idle to presume upon a categorical decision here, when such names as those of Neander and Schaff are not in agreement. No doubt there will always be two sides to the question. However, the higher probability seems to be in favor of acquittal; of subsequent work in Greece, in Asia Minor, and in Crete; of (possibly) a brief visit to Spain; of a second imprisonment, and of martyrdom in Rome in the last year of Nero's reign.

It has been assumed that Paul was chosen to take the place of Judas, the selection of Matthias not having been directed by the Holy Spirit; or of James, the brother of John, who was slain by Herod. But there is a deeper significance than that in Paul's presence among the apostles. Israel itself should have been God's missionary people to other peoples. But they "rejected the counsel of God against themselves." They would not be convinced even by the resurrection of Jesus. They persecuted the church. They murdered Stephen, and they murdered James. They were proud of their particularism, and they determined to maintain it. They were formalists, legalists, traditionalists, nationalists. They would murder, but they would not accept and teach a loftier faith and larger hope than such as centered in

themselves. Even the Jerusalem church, though not overruled by the Judaizing party, was crippled by it. From that nation, therefore, and even from that church, there was no hope of a world-wide work. *Paul was chosen to do a nation's work*, and he did it as completely as ever one mortal, divinely directed, could take the place of myriads. And moreover, he did it in spite of those myriads.

The number of the Apostle Paul's students and admirers must increase with increasing ages. Among great students, whether professors of his faith or not, there is all but unanimity in eulogy. Farrar ranks him as the greatest man of all times, Christ being, of course, excepted from the comparison as being more than man. Sabatier says of him: "The lofty character of Paul has not always been properly apprehended because it has too often been considered from a narrow point of view. Its striking originality seems to be due to the fruitful combination in it of two spiritual forces, two orders of faculty which are seldom found united in this day in one personality, and which in the case of Jesus alone presented themselves more perfectly blended and carried even to a further height than in the apostle. I mean dialectic power and religious inspiration, the rational and the mystic element. Or to borrow Paul's own language, the activity of the mind (νοῦς) and of the spirit (πνεῦμα)."

Godet says: "The calling of Paul was nothing less than the counterpart of Abraham's. The life

of Paul is summed up in a word; a unique man for a unique task." "O Christianity, had thy one work been to produce a St. Paul, that alone would have rendered thee dear to the coldest reason."

XIII.

THE FIRST HISTORY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE CHURCH

"Christ is the second Adam, who, having recapitulated the long development of humanity into himself, taken it up into himself, that is, and healed its wounds and fructified its barrenness, gives it a fresh start by a new birth from him. The Spirit coming forth at Pentecost out of his uplifted manhood, as from a glorious fountain of new life, perpetuates all its richness, its power, its fullness in the organized society of humanity which he prepared and built for the Spirit's habitation. The church, his Spirit-bearing body, comes forth into the world, not as the exclusive sphere of the Spirit's operations, for 'that breath bloweth where it listeth,' but as the special and covenanted sphere of his regular and uniform operation, the place where he is pledged to dwell and to work; the center marked out and hedged in, whence ever and again proceeds forth anew the work of human recovery; the home where, in spite of sin and imperfection, is ever kept the picture of what the Christian life is, of what common human life is meant to be and can become."—*Lux Mundi.*

XIII.

THE FIRST HISTORY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE CHURCH.

"And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."—*Acts ii. 4.*

LUKE is a historian. He has his method. He records facts. He does not syllogize, he does not legislate, he does not speculate. Prayer-meetings and prisons and earthquakes and miracles of release stand recorded side by side. Men and angels and sorcerers play their proper roles as belonging alike to the drama. In the same paragraph appear an ordinary journey and a miraculous conversion. In marvelous ways fishermen and publicans confront high priests and their councils; Jews mingle with Gentiles; cursing murderers are contrasted with praying martyrs; missionaries in chains cause Roman rulers to tremble, and spiritual direction marks a pathway transverse to that of carnal tradition. Here miracles are mingled with commonplace matters just as though they were at home there. They are written down without exclamation points. Mystery becomes history, and there is no interrogation. In the first church the supernatural found such a congenial home with the natural that the first historian of it never dreamed of questioning its rightful

residence there. He simply tells about it as Cæsar tells about Gaul. Among the lofty persons that move upon the stage of this history the Holy Spirit has his place, and there is such a relationship between his presence and the course recorded that without the former the latter is inexplicable. Luke does not theorize, but when he sets before us a supernatural course of history, he sets before us at the same time the supernatural person that reason demands as its coefficient. His method is as admirable as his material is wonderful.

In the book of Acts three persons above all others bear witness to a fourth. These three are the missionaries Peter and Paul, and their guide, the Holy Spirit. Reverently, these three are one in bearing witness to Christ. If the language is startling, it is intended. Here, absolutely, is where our study of the Holy Spirit in the church of Christ must begin.

And no study is more needful, for the Holy Spirit has been a great sufferer in the house of his friends. There is no emulation, wrath, strife, or sedition among Christians for which the Holy Spirit has not been made to suffer responsibility. There is no schismatic or heretic but claims his guidance. The meanest ignoramus cloaks his most trifling and despicable whims under the Holy Spirit, and calls them revelations. Evangelistic follies and frenzies parade their shoutings, their shame and their disorder as the power of the Spirit. We have listened to the profane man on the street, and we have called

him a blasphemer, but we have not gone into our temples to condemn the blasphemy that is there, where men put the Holy Spirit himself up as a defense of their bigotry, cruelty, and hatred, and make him the inspirer of their creeds, their thumbscrews, their mystic ravings, and even their immoralities. Whittier's terrible arraignment, in his "Brewing of the Soma," has a historic justification too ample by far:

"As in that child-world's early year,
Each after age has striven
By music, incense, vigils drear,
And trance to bring the skies more near,
Or lift men up to heaven!—

"Some fever of the blood and brain,
Some self-exalting spell,
The scourger's keen delight of pain,
The Dervish dance, the Orphic strain,
The wild-haired Bacchant's yell,—

"And yet the past comes round again,
And new doth old fulfill;
In sensuous transports wild as vain
We brew in many a Christian fane
The heathen Soma still!"

Beginning with the history of Luke, we are reminded of the promises of Jesus. The fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of the Gospel according to John are cardinal to the study of the Holy Spirit. In these chapters he is most frequently called the Comforter, though the original may also be translated Helper, or Advocate, understanding that the friendship meaning of that word be kept in it,

and the forensic meaning be kept out of it. Once the Savior calls him the Spirit of truth. In these chapters the promised relationship of the Holy Spirit to the apostles is expressed under four general heads.

1. "He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you" (John xiv. 26).

2. "He shall testify of me" (John xv. 26).

3. "He shall glorify me" (John xvi. 14).

4. "He will guide you into all truth" (John xvi. 13).

The fourth of these is practically inclusive of the first, and the second of the third, for teaching and remembrance are the instruments of guidance, and to testify of Jesus, simply to present him as he is, is the highest glorification of him. This reduces them to two:

"He shall testify of me."

"He shall guide you into all truth."

There is a negative promise which serves to emphasize both of these: "He shall not speak of himself" (John xvi. 13). These explicit promises, two positive and one negative, were made on the night before the betrayal, and they have every possible prominence that can be given to them by the solemnities of time and place.

This study would by no means be complete did it not include a reference to the promise contained in John xvi. 8: "When he is come he will convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment."

This promise has been left till the last because the convincing power of the Holy Spirit depended upon his guidance of the witnesses, and their consequent testimony regarding Jesus. It is with clear intuition of this that Godet says, "The discourse of St. Peter at Pentecost and its results are the best commentary on this text." These promises, therefore, divinely prescribe the office and work of the Holy Spirit. Luke's history shows their fulfillment.

On the day of Pentecost the apostles were guided by the Holy Spirit in their speech, for it is said that they spoke "as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts ii. 4). The Apostle Peter's sermon was therefore Spirit-guided, and forever as we read it we feel that it is replete with testimony concerning Christ. The apostle's answer to inquiring sinners is likewise Spirit-guided, and his command to them to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus glorifies Christ by making the very imagery of his death and resurrection the very symbol of conversion and salvation.

The apostles showed their painful need of guidance by the last question they proposed to Jesus before his ascension. "Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" O carnal-minded men! Your mission is not to restore the kingdom to Israel, but to testify of Jesus! You have nothing to do to fight Rome, but to preach the Gospel! With such questions foremost you are not fit for the work! Wait! "You shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you,

and you shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth" (Acts i. 6-8). Given the Jewish, carnal-minded apostles on the one hand; on the other, the purely spiritual products of Pentecost; then cancel from the record the agency of the Holy Spirit, and such a gap remains as the intellect refuses to sanction. Such fruit does not grow from such trees. Cause and effect are not properly matched. Such writing would seem mythical. But the miracle that the intellect demands the record presents, and the writing immediately assumes the form of history. The Holy Spirit, personal, intelligent, powerful, is present, and this miracle makes all else natural. The apostles forget Israel; they remember Christ and preach him; they had trembled on the night of his betrayal, but they are heroes now; they declare courageously and mightily the resurrection and the Lordship of Jesus; their hearers are convicted of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment; and the young church comes forth in the strength and beauty of a spiritual faith, a spiritual love, and a spiritual hope. The Holy Spirit is logical. Myths and "cunningly devised fables" do not fabricate causes that are adequate to effects like this, and interlock promises with their fulfillment like this.

When Peter gave his answer to Annas the high priest (iv. 5-12) he was filled with the Holy Spirit. His testimony was wholly for Jesus, and he exalted him to an exclusive place, saying, "There is none

other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." In the praise meeting that followed the acquittal (iv. 31), "they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and they spake the word of God with boldness."

The presence and the presidency of the Holy Spirit in the church is assumed by the Apostle Peter when he accuses Ananias of lying to the Holy Spirit (v. 3).

Men chosen to prominence in the church were expected to be "full of the Holy Spirit." Stephen the martyr was pre-eminently such a man (vi. 3-5). They were not able to resist "the wisdom and spirit with which he spake." The climax of his accusation against his people was that they "always resisted the Holy Spirit;" that therefore they had persecuted the prophets, and had slain Jesus, making themselves his betrayers and murderers (vii. 51-53).

Undoubtedly there were visible and audible signs of the presence of the Holy Spirit. This was the rule and not the exception. The first Christians knew when the Holy Spirit fell upon them (viii. 14-20). There was something to be seen and heard that Simon wanted to buy, and his groveling mistake gave his name to the world as a synonym for all filthy, lucrative traffic in holy things.

The mission of Ananias to Saul was not simply to baptize him, but also "that he might receive his sight, and be filled with the Holy Spirit." Presently this Spirit-filled man "preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God," and thus

was performed the "office work" of the Holy Spirit, and the glorification of Jesus (ix. 17-20).

When the churches in Judæa and Galilee and Samaria "walked in the fear of the Lord, and the comfort of the Holy Spirit," they were multiplied and edified (ix. 31).

The Holy Spirit fell upon Cornelius and his household before their baptism. Thus he guided the Apostle Peter and the church into the transforming truth that the Gentiles were to be received just as the Jews were, simply upon the basis of the presentation of Christ and of faith in him. "What was I that I could withstand God?" said Peter afterward in making his defense to his Jewish brethren in Jerusalem (x. 44-48, and xi. 15-18. See also essay on "The First Gentile Convert"). In the first council (xv. 6-11) this fact was used by Peter as an unanswerable argument.

Of Barnabas it is said, "He was a good man, and full of the Holy Spirit and of faith," indicating that the Holy Spirit finds hospitality where goodness and faith also dwell. Under the ministry of this man in the Gentile Church of Antioch "much people was added unto the Lord." No doubt this good and faithful man was Spirit-led also when he did so wise a thing as to seek out Saul and make him an associate in his ministry (xi. 22-27).

In the thirteenth chapter of Acts there is the record of a new movement. The camp of the Lord with its pillar of fire must now move forward into

the darkness of pagan lands. The church must become a foreign missionary society. The historian is very emphatic in the part he assigns to the Holy Spirit in this movement. "The Holy Spirit said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Here the Holy Spirit, fulfilling his "office work" in guiding the church and glorifying Jesus, calls the men and commands the church to send them out. But, as though this were not explicit enough, the matter is restated in the fourth verse in language as plain as language can be. "So they being sent forth by the Holy Spirit departed unto Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus."

From this time the Apostle Paul becomes the leading character in the book, and the Holy Spirit is his closest companion. Filled with the Spirit, he rebuked Elymas, the sorcerer (xiii. 9-11.) Forbidden by the Spirit, he refrained from a missionary journey through Northern Asia Minor, and soon discovered that the Spirit was guiding him, by the help of the "Man of Macedonia," into Europe (xvi. 6-10). Thus he was led to preach in Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens and Corinth. At Ephesus he found disciples of John, to whom he imparted the Holy Spirit, after they were baptized in the name of Jesus. "And they spake with tongues and prophesied" (xix. 1-7). He would not be dissuaded from going to Jerusalem, though the Holy Spirit assured him that in that city, as in every other, bonds and afflic-

tions awaited him (xx. 22, 23). He reminded the elders of the church in Ephesus that the Holy Spirit had made them overseers of the flock (xx. 28). In his last recorded speech, and therefore, so far as this record goes, his last meeting and parting with his Jewish brethren, he charged them in the name of the Holy Spirit, quoting Isaiah, of blindness and deafness, and hardness of heart (xxviii. 16-28). Still one other noteworthy reference claims its place among the above. When the Church in council rendered its decision as to the status of the Gentiles it claimed to be Spirit-guided, saying, as an introduction to the decision, "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit, and to us . . . " (xv. 28).

Having collated the Scriptures and summarized the history pertinent to the theme, it remains to offer some reflections and leave the reader to judge whether they are legitimate conclusions.

The Holy Spirit was the guiding genius of the church. He made it cosmopolitan, and he made it missionary.

His was the presence, often but not always, of an audible, visible, intelligible intelligence. This presence, called metaphorically the baptism of the Spirit, was not confined to the apostles, nor even to the first Gentiles in the home of Cornelius. The promise of "the gift of the Holy Spirit" (ii. 38), must upon any fair construction refer to this presence. To the re-baptized disciples of John in Ephesus was granted this presence (xix. 1-6). The study

upon this point may be carried forward into the epistolary writings, especially the first letter to the Corinthians.

This presence was conditioned upon the preaching of the Gospel, and might either precede or succeed, but never supersede, baptism.

The book of Acts gives us no indication of an intention on the part of the Holy Spirit to resign his office in favor of a written word. If there was such an intention, or such a resignation, the record of it must be found elsewhere.

. The apostles had no written word by which they could be guided in the building of a cosmopolitan, missionary church. The New Testament had yet to be created, and to be created by them under the direction of the Holy Spirit. The Old Testament would not do, for its cult is neither cosmopolitan nor missionary. The narrow limits of its legalism were a constant offset to the aspirations of its prophetism. But the Holy Spirit supplied the place of a book, and how much more one dares not attempt to say. Nevertheless, Christians can never cease to remember with gratitude that they have from the Holy Spirit while he dwelt audibly and visibly in the church, the gift of a collection of books, which we call the New Testament, and which, as distinguished from the Mosaic Bible, is the Christian Bible.

Revelation was the work of Jesus; inspiration was that of the Holy Spirit. "He shall not speak of himself. He shall take of mine, and shall show it

unto you." The quickening of the memory of the apostles, the fitting of their words to the needs of the hour, the adjustment of men and measures to the accomplishment of ends that were desirable, as in the appointment of the seven deacons and the sending out of Paul and Barnabas, are indicative of the whole tenor of his inspirational work. Jesus himself revealed himself to Saul of Tarsus; after the revelation the Holy Spirit became Saul's helper. This placed him upon the same basis of revelation and inspiration that belonged to the other apostles.

It is evident that the relation of the Holy Spirit to us cannot be identical with that to the apostles. He cannot quicken our memories with the words of Jesus as he did theirs, for Jesus has not spoken to us as to them. He cannot use us in an evidential way as he did them, for we have never seen and heard Jesus. It may be for this reason that there are not given to us the extraordinary powers of the Spirit, such as healing and speaking with tongues.

The immediate conversion of sinners was not the work of the Holy Spirit. That would be mysticism. But through men to testify to the man Christ, and through men to glorify the man Christ, and through men to take of the things of Christ and show them to the world,—this was his work. Christ is the revelation of truth. It is truth that convicts. It is evidence that substantiates truth. Along this rational highway the Holy Spirit guided the apostles and the first church in the work of evangelization.

Does the Holy Spirit abide in the church to-day, and does he make his home with Christians individually? We do not work miracles; we do not prophesy; we do not speak with tongues. But,—"The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." HAVE WE THE FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT? This only is our capital question.

"No more from rocky Horeb the smitten waters gush;
Fallen is Bethel's ladder, quenched is the burning bush.
The jewels of the Urim and Thummim all are dim;
The fire has left the altar, the sign the teraphim.
No more in ark or hill or grove, the Holiest abides;
Not in the scroll's dead letter, the eternal secret hides.
Have ye not still my witness within yourselves alway?
My hand that on the keys of life for bliss or bale I lay?
Still in perpetual judgment, I hold assize within,
With sure reward of holiness, and dread rebuke of sin.
My Gerizim and Ebal are in each human soul;
The still, small voice of blessing, and Sinai's thunder roll.
The world will have its idols, and flesh and sense their sign;
But the blinded eyes shall open, and the grossest ear be fine.
What if the vision tarry? God's time is always best;
The true light shall be witnessed, the Christ within confessed."

Even so. "The Christ within!" And no less also the Christ without; the historic Christ; the risen, the ascended, the now regnant Christ shall be confessed. And that through the witness of the Holy Spirit, also historic, and speaking evermore as Peter spoke on Pentecost, as Paul spoke in Antioch, in Athens, in Corinth, and in Rome.

XIV.

EXCURSUS. THE APOSTLE PAUL AS ORGANIZER AND UNIFIER

"Nothing is essential to the conversion of the world but the union and co-operation of Christians. Nothing is essential to the union of Christians but the apostles' teaching or testimony. Neither truth alone nor union alone is sufficient to subdue the unbelieving nations. But truth and union combined are omnipotent. They are omnipotent, for God is in them and with them, and has consecrated and blessed them for this very purpose."—*A. Campbell, Christian System.*

XIV.

EXCURSUS. THE APOSTLE PAUL AS ORGANIZER AND UNIFIER.

"Now after many years I came to bring alms to my nation, and offerings."—*Acts xxiv. 17.*

THE Apostle Paul's emergence in history is as an organizer and leader of men. At the first mention of his name there is a recognition of his primacy in persecution. "The witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul." A moment later the historian, speaking still further of the martyrdom of Stephen, says, "And Saul was consenting to his death." And still a moment later, "As for Saul, he made havoc of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women, committed them to prison." There for a time in solitary prominence of blood-stained activity, with strangely mournful, and even frightful and terrible introduction, Luke leaves his hero standing.

No less than nine chapters, and at least twelve passages of the New Testament, bear witness to the thoroughness and the terror of his organized persecutions. Aside from him, no other persistent and systematic persecutor is brought before us. It is well to note a number of these passages, for they have not received the attention they deserve in making up our

estimate of Paul's character and influence. The word havoc, used in one of the passages quoted above, occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, and Farrar tells us that in the Septuagint and in classic Greek it is applied to the wild boars that uproot a vineyard. In close connection with this word, so graphic of destruction, it is said that "he entered into every house, and haling men and women, committed them to prison," indicating an organized and systematic, as well as a relentless, persecution. In the first verses of the ninth chapter of Acts, there is the record of his "threatenings and slaughter," which he is described as "breathing out," and also of his plan for an authorized and organized campaign of persecution among all the synagogues of Damascus. In both these passages it is especially noted by Luke that he did not spare women even. His fame as a persecutor had preceded him to Damascus, for Ananias says, "I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem; and here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on thy name."

The apostle himself, both in his speeches and his letters, has told us of his persecutions with such brevity and emphasis as are indicative of painful recollections, but also in such terms as to show system and thoroughness. In Acts xxii. 4 he says: "I persecuted this way unto the death, binding and delivering into prisons both men and women." In

chapter xxvi. 10, 11 he says: "Many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the chief priests; and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them. And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme; and being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities." In I. Cor. xv. 9 he calls himself the least of the apostles, because he "persecuted the church of God." In Gal. i. 13 he says that "beyond measure he persecuted the church of God and wasted it." And in I. Tim. i. 13 he refers to his former life in language of almost unrestrained self-condemnation as having been "a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and an insulter in word and deed."

There is every indication that this man's work of persecution was not spasmodic and haphazard, but that it was a well concerted and definitely directed plan for the extermination of Christianity, and there appears in it all the genius of leadership, of action, of organization, and of direction. It is interesting to speculate upon the probable history of the young church had this man not been converted. It seems not too much to say that the weight of this one man's influence, as thrown into the scale for or against Christ, meant all but all of life or death to the cause of Christ.

It is impossible to say how much Paul had to do with the organization and inception of the first foreign missionary enterprise of the Antioch church.

The Holy Spirit is represented as taking the initiative, and saying, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have appointed them." Instruction and inspiration are closely correlated in the Gospel, and it is not improbable that the teaching of Barnabas and Saul had prepared the church for the movement authorized by the Holy Spirit. However, it is a fact that Paul was a leader in the work from the first, and that before the evangelization of the island of Cyprus was completed, he became the leader in it. The moment in which his name was changed from Saul to Paul fixes the date of his recognized leadership in the evangelistic movements of the church (xiii. 9).

There is a definite statement to the effect that the second missionary journey was proposed by Paul (xv. 36). After his disagreement with Barnabas, he chose Silas, "and departed, being recommended by the brethren to the grace of God. And he went through Syria and Cilicia confirming the churches." The choice of Silas is significant, and has a bearing on the Jewish-Gentile controversy, as we shall see below.

The third missionary journey had its beginning as described in Acts xviii. 23. Paul departed from Antioch, "and went through all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strengthening all the disciples." During this journey he did his great work at Ephesus, passed through Macedonia and

Greece, and returned through Macedonia to Troas on his way to Jerusalem.

These journeys are so briefly narrated that upon casual reading we by no means get the full impress of their significance. We should picture to ourselves an evangelistic movement extending from Jerusalem and Antioch in Syria through Cilicia, Lycaonia, Pisidia, Galatia, Caria, Lydia, Mysia, Macedonia, Achaia, and Italy, and the islands of Cyprus and Crete; as the chief figure in the personnel of this movement, Paul, supporting himself a part of the time at least by daily labor, yet preaching and lecturing constantly in schools or synagogues or his own private house; selecting and training young men, such as Timothy and Titus and Epaphras and Onesimus and Aristarchus and Tychicus and Trophimus, and sending them out as messengers and evangelists and overseers, thus taking upon himself "the care of all the churches;" through amanuenses and messengers posting to the churches of his creation imperishable letters; suffering constant and many times perilous persecution; now stoned, now imprisoned, now and again fronting furious mobs, and now and again shipwrecked; organizing churches; ordaining elders; restraining lawlessness; proclaiming liberty; meanwhile not forgetting "the poor saints that were in Jerusalem," but intent upon carrying out in their behalf a general and thoroughly systematized series of collections among the churches of Galatia, Macedonia, and Achaia; all the while also defending the

Gospel from the attacks of Judaizers on the one hand, and on the other from the most imminent danger of internal discord—all this and more must go to make up an adequate summary of that majestic movement, which had Christ for its inspiration, and the Apostle Paul for the first of its human agencies. To many a church other than that in Corinth he might have written, saying, "Though you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel. Wherefore I beseech you, be ye followers of me."

In the organization of churches the Apostle Paul seems to have been guided by three principles. There was first, the historic or conservative principle, viz., his regard for the constitution of the Jewish synagogues which were to be found in every considerable city. Upon the synagogue plan the Mother Church in Jerusalem was modeled, and the Gentile churches held continuity with it by being similarly organized. This was a point not to be despised as regarded the question of unity. The official functions of the elders (otherwise presbyters or bishops), and of the deacons or ministers, were derived from the synagogue, the elders of the one corresponding to the elders of the other, and the deacons of the one to the almoners of the other. In the synagogue there was also a "legate of the congregation," or "leader of divine worship," whose reproduction we seem to have in "the angel of

the church," the officer addressed in the letters to the churches in the book of Revelation. Upon their first missionary journey the apostles Paul and Barnabas took care that elders were appointed in every church (Acts xiv. 23). Paul, having left Titus in Crete, instructed him to appoint elders in every city (Titus i. 5). In these passages nothing is said about deacons, a significant silence, surely. Perhaps that office was not considered immediately essential to the young churches. However, Paul, in writing to the Philippian church, addresses the "bishops (elders) and deacons;" he also instructs Timothy as to the character of the men who should be appointed to this office (I. Tim. iii. 12).

It is a matter of great moment that the synagogue, rather than the temple, became the model of the first churches. The latter, with its sacrificial service and sacerdotal orders, drops entirely out of the problem, and as a factor in the organized work of Christianity seems to have been as entirely discarded as though it had never existed. There is never in the record of any Christian church of apostolic origin the slightest intimation of anything like the old altar forms of worship, and the priestly class of the Mosaic cult is left absolutely behind in the transition from the one dispensation to the other. No apostolic Christian ever posed as a priest except in the sense that they all, from the least to the greatest of them, were both "kings and priests unto God." All priestly functions, aside from these most general ones that per-

tain to the whole body of believers, were forever gathered up into his person who died for us, and who by reason of his resurrection is "Priest forever after the order of Melchisedec," that is, after an order wholly independent and unique. The claim of any professed Christian that he is more priest than another, is an ignorant or an impudent usurpation of Christ's office, and likewise an ignorant or an impudent blasphemy against his blood-bought mediatorship. There were no altar forms of worship, therefore, nor was there any priestly class in the churches organized by Paul. In the Pauline dispensation the brother who "is apt to teach," or to dispense alms, has forever taken the place of the skillful slayer of beasts, the sprinkler of water and blood and ashes.

In the second place, Paul was governed by the principle of liberty under the direction of the Holy Spirit. The Pauline churches were far from being limited in their organization to the synagogue model. The new wine of the Spirit could not be imprisoned in the old bottles. Two lists of functions within the church, whether official or charismatic, are given by Paul, one in I. Cor. xii. 28, and the other in Eph. iv. 11. These lists are not in entire correspondence, and therefore the apostle must not be considered as treating the subject from a technical, much less a legalistic standpoint. Indeed such treatment would seem to be foreign to the genius of Christianity, for where the Spirit is there is liberty rather than legality. In the first of these lists it is hard to say

where the official functions end and the charismatic ones begin, and perhaps we do not need to attempt a rigid distinction. Perhaps we get a better view of the official freedom and spiritual genius of Christianity by leaving them as the apostle has left them.

"God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps (*i. e.*, functions of the diaconate; Variorum Bible), governments (*i. e.*, functions of the presbyterate; Variorum Bible), diversities of tongues" (I. Cor. xii. 28).

"And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers" (Eph. iv. 11).

As intimated above, our present interest in these lists lies in the fact of their differences. Neither includes all the offices or gifts of the other, and we are led to this conclusion, viz., that there were some offices and gifts in the Corinthian church that were unknown to the Ephesian church, and *vice versa;* or this, viz., that the Apostle Paul did not care to be technically exact in his enumeration. In either case there is an indication of liberty rather than of legalism, and in the former of diversity in unity.

Sabatier, in his work entitled, "The Apostle Paul," has the following suggestive paragraph bearing upon this point. "All development implies variety; and hence the apostle perceives and acknowledges in the church diverse offices, gifts, and ministries (I. Cor. xii. 4). To each of these

separate gifts he allows free and full development; and through them the wealth of life in the church is manifested. But on the other hand these different charisms proceed from one and the same spirit (I. Cor. xii. 11). And with love as their common inspiration, all tend to the same goal, the perfecting of the whole body of the church. So the unity of the church is, in the first instance, broken up and expanded into a rich variety; but this in turn is absorbed into the supreme unity. Such is the organic and harmonious development of the life of the church."

In the third place, Paul was governed by the principle of expediency in many matters pertaining to organization. No doubt it was expedient that Titus should be left in Crete to set in order the things that were wanting (Titus i. 5); to ordain elders in every city; and to exhort and rebuke with all authority (ii. 15). This seems to indicate an office distinct from any yet named, and so far as Paul's writings go it is left without a name. Was Titus the overseer of all Crete, and was he then a bishop over the congregational bishops, and is there here a precedent for the episcopal form of church polity? The position of Timothy in Ephesus is similar to that of Titus in Crete. When Paul went into Macedonia he found it expedient that Timothy should abide in Ephesus (I. Tim. i. 3); that he should have general supervision of doctrine; of the appointing of elders and deacons (I. Tim. iii.), and of the salaries of eld-

ers (I. Tim. v. 17), granting double pay or support (honor is the euphemism used by Paul) to those who should rule well; and with authority also to rebuke and exhort under certain limitations. Intense interest attaches to the position and functions of these two men. But whatever conclusions we may come to regarding them there is no record of similar officials having been sent into other regions or cities, such as Macedonia or Achaia, or Philippi or Corinth. It is argued, therefore, that in the Apostle Paul's judgment it must have been simply a matter of expediency that these men should be stationed permanently, the one in Crete, the other in Ephesus, with functions superior to those of the elders of the congregations; and that, on the contrary, in his judgment the exigencies in other churches or districts did not call for such an expedient in the way of organization and government.

Another example of the rule of expediency in church organization is found in the office of the *Patronus* or *Patrona*, not many notices of which are given us in the New Testament. There is one clear case, however, if the interpretation of Kurtz may be relied on. In Rom. xvi. 1 and 2 we have the following language: "I commend unto you Phebe our sister, who is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea; that ye receive her in the Lord as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you; for she hath been a succourer (Protectress; Variorum Bible) of many,

and of myself also." Kurtz in his Church History characterizes this as "a peculiar kind of ministry which must soon have developed as something indispensable to the Christian churches throughout the Hellenic and Roman regions, so deeply grounded in the social life of classical antiquity was the part played by the patron. Freedmen, foreigners, proletarii could not in themselves hold property, and had no claim on the protection of the laws, but had to be associated as *Clientes* with a *Patronus* or *Patrona*, who in difficult circumstances would afford them counsel, protection, support and defense. As in the Greek and Roman associations for worship this relationship had long before taken root, and was one of the things that contributed most materially to their prosperity, so also in the Christian churches the need for recognizing and giving effect to it became all the more urgent in proportion as the number of members increased for whom such support was necessary. Phebe is warmly commended as such a Christian *Patrona* (Protectress) at Cenchrea, the port of Corinth, among whose numerous clients the apostle himself is mentioned. Many inscriptions in the Roman catacombs testify to the deep impress which this social scheme made upon the organization, especially of the Roman church, down to the end of the first century, and to the help it gave in rendering that church permanent."

It would be impossible to find a better example of an office created entirely upon the principle of ex-

pediency, or one more completely discarded as the conditions passed away from which it sprang.

The Apostle Paul, though thus engaged in his great enterprises of evangelization and organization, was at the same time equally intent upon preserving the unity of the body of Christ. Aside from Christ's high-priestly prayer as recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John, the New Testament literature upon the subject of unity is almost wholly from the pen of Paul. His pictured logic of unity is embraced in the figure of the church as a body with many members and many functions, but moved by the same spirit (Rom. xii. 4 and 5; I. Cor. xii. 12); in his figure of the church as the body of which Christ is the head (Eph. i. 22 and 23; iv. 15 and 16); and in his figure of the one body with the one spirit, answering to the one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all (Eph. iv. 4-6). He was quick to chide the church in Corinth for its incipient divisions; he exhorted the Christians in Rome to be of the same mind one toward another; he prays the Philippians to fulfill his joy by maintaining like-mindedness, having the same love, being of one accord; he instructs both Timothy and Titus to avoid foolish and unlearned questions because they gender strifes; he commands that those who cause divisions shall be marked and avoided, and that the heretic shall be rejected after a first and second admonition. These references are sufficient to show how constantly the Apostle Paul

kept the unity of the church before his mind, how close it was to his heart, and how jealously he guarded it.

There is still one other principle that enters into the Apostle Paul's dealings with churches of such a general and comprehensive nature as to deserve separate classification and treatment. It is a principle inherent in the very substance of the Gospel, and to eliminate it would be well-nigh to eliminate the Gospel as a social force from the affairs of societies and nations. It is the democratic or brotherly principle of government, and although it is a matter of prime importance it must be dismissed here in a single paragraph. The Apostle Paul never lorded over the congregations; he did not dogmatize; he did not dictate; he was not a pope. He instructs, he advises, he entreats, he pleads and prays, but never permits himself to go beyond the affection of a father and the persuasion of an elder brother. It was not his to claim dominion over faith, but to be a helper in joy (II. Cor. i. 24). He ranks himself with Apollos as being only a minister (deacon) through whom the Corinthian Christians came to their faith (I. Cor. iii. 5). As a father he warns the Corinthians, appealing to them as his beloved sons, and reminding them that though they may have ten thousand instructors they cannot have many fathers (I. Cor. iv. 14-17). Withdrawal from a brother was enjoined as an action on the part of the whole church, the apostle assum-

ing only a spiritual presence in the affair (I. Cor. v. 1-5).

Kurtz presents us with an excellent summary of this matter in the following sentences: "Confining ourselves to the oldest and indisputably authentic epistles of Paul, we find that the autonomy of the church in respect of organization, government, discipline and internal administration is made prominent as the very basis of its constitution. He never interferes in those matters, enjoining and prescribing by his own authority, but always, whether personally or in spirit, only as associated with their assemblies, deliberating and deciding in common with them."

The means that the Apostle Paul adopted as looking to the permanent unity of the church are of transcendent interest in a time like this, when many of the choicest spirits in many of our denominations are longing for the reunion of Christ's mournfully dissevered body.

The Jewish-Gentile question was the all but insurmountable one of the Apostle Paul's day, and no question was ever fraught with greater dangers to an incipient movement. To the Jews, the Gentiles were despicable and hateful, and to the Gentiles the Jews were already a hiss and by-word. In manners and morals they were in antipathy; in faith and worship they were in antagonism. The prejudices and traditions of many generations had intensified the natural dislike between monotheists on the one hand, and polytheists on the other; between social and cer-

emonial cleanness here, and lustful and idolatrous pollutions there; and finally, between peoples each alike proudly conscious of the divine choice in their own behalf, and as proudly convinced of the divine abandonment of all others.

Christianity set herself to the problem of reconciling these irreconcilables, and aside from the influence of the Gospel and of the Holy Spirit in regeneration, the Apostle Paul's is by far the largest factor in the work. He seems from the first to have determined upon two things, namely, that the liberty of the Gentiles should not be infringed, and that the unity of the church should not be disturbed. Not legislation, or creed formulation, but education, prudence, and brotherly love were the factors upon which he relied in the solution of the problem.

It is impossible to say how much the Apostle Paul had to do in bringing about the first council (treated in a previous Essay), but it is very like a work of his from first to last. We know that he was at Antioch when the proposition was made to go up to Jerusalem to the apostles and elders about the matter, and such a proposition would come naturally from one so fertile in methods and so desirous of conciliating as Paul. We know also that Paul was one of the delegates sent up to Jerusalem (Acts xv. 2), and we know that he conferred privately with the leading apostles or members of the Jerusalem church, "lest by any means he should run in vain" (Gal. ii. 2). His private conference (a mark of his prudence, by the

way,) with such as "were of reputation," must have had much to do with the favorable decision of the council, and is not to be forgotten in our estimate of Paul's leadership upon the questions of liberty and union. Then, how graciously he accepted the compromise, and how promptly he went out among the Gentile churches, "delivering them the decrees for to keep." The council and the decrees were educational and prudential as related both to the Jews and the Gentiles.

In several other respects, Paul's prudence is admirably shown. First, when he could no longer be accompanied by Barnabas he chose Silas. Now Silas was a representative man of the Jerusalem church, a prophet, and an exhorter, and one of the brethren chosen to accompany Paul and Barnabas to Antioch when they delivered the decrees. By making this man his traveling-companion and yoke-fellow among the Gentiles, he shielded himself from the suspicions of the Jewish Christians, and he gained among the Gentile Christians a double confirmation of the decrees.

The circumcision of Timothy was another prudential measure. Here no principle was at stake, inasmuch as Timothy's mother was a Jewess, a point that Luke makes especially prominent (Acts xvi. 1-3).

Upon his last visit to Jerusalem, at the suggestion of James, Paul undertook to purify himself with the four men who had a vow, and to be at charges with

them. This also was a prudential measure (Acts xxi. 21-24). Paul could conscientiously do this, being a Jew, but we cannot imagine him enjoining it upon any Gentile. No doubt it had the desired effect upon Jerusalem Jews, for we are told that the disturbance was created by "Jews which were of Asia."

It is a meaningful fact that succeeding every one of his great missionary journeys, Paul made a visit to Jerusalem. After his first missionary journey came the council in Jerusalem. At the close of his second journey, having landed at Cæsarea, he went up and saluted the church in Jerusalem before he went down to Antioch (Acts xviii. 22). At the close of his third journey, he determined to go up to Jerusalem, even at the risk of his life, and that though he was longing even then to visit Rome. He refused to be dissuaded from this visit, and said: "Behold, I go bound in the spirit to Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there, save that the Holy Spirit witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me. But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God" (Acts xx. 22-24).

Why was he so intent upon reaching Jerusalem? Others could have carried and distributed the alms entrusted to him. Though he planned to reach the city by Pentecost, he must long since have come to

look upon the Mosaic feasts as of no vital importance. But that he, the apostle to the Gentiles, should keep in touch with the mother church, that he should in person refute the falsehoods of the Judaizers, that he should report, as Peter did upon his return from Cæsarea, the work of the Holy Spirit among the Gentiles, and that he should hold close the bonds of mutual knowledge and regard between these two peoples,—this was a matter of the first importance. These visits, therefore, were most highly prudential.

Supreme above all else in the Apostle Paul's constructive policy was the principle of love. One never sees it treated nowadays as a fundamental principle of unity, and yet that is what Paul made of it both theoretically and practically. Over all eloquence and offices and gifts rises love; over faith and hope even rises love. Paul agrees with John in making love the highest orthodoxy, and the deepest heresy, hate. The thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians is not a panegyric only; it is a union platform. Where love to Christ is supreme, faith cannot get far away from him, and where love toward men is, there follows a community of learning and faith. Therefore faith needs scarcely any other defense than love, and union scarcely any other bond. Our sins against the law of love have been the heaviest cross of heresy that the body of Christ has had to bear, and of all destructive isms, Cainism has been the most destructive.

But Paul did not rest in panegyrics; he was a man of action as well as diction. How did he apply his union platform of love to the Jewish-Gentile controversy?

By reason of persecution, or famine, or from some cause unknown, there were many poor saints in Jerusalem. Twice the Apostle Paul came bringing help from Gentile Christians, once from Antioch at the time of the famine, when he and Barnabas remained probably many months ministering to the needy; and once from the Gentile Christians of Galatia and Macedonia and Achaia. The poor Jewish believer, receiving his daily food for months at a time from the hands of Paul, and recognizing that it came from uncircumcised believers, or at least from a mixed church, must have had his heart gradually but also greatly softened on the subject of Gentile circumcision. Unless his own heart were of stone, it must have been borne in upon him that after all, though his Gentile benefactors bore not in the flesh the mark of Abraham, yet their brotherly hearts were sufficiently circumcised.

> "All hearts confess the saints elect
> Who, twain in faith, in love agree;
> And melt not in an acid sect
> The Christian pearl of charity."

The contributions from the churches of Galatia and Macedonia and Achaia must have been on a large scale. For a long time these churches had been gathering systematically, "laying by them in store

as the Lord prospered them," and bringing it together weekly at their Lord's day worship. In his first letter to the Corinthians Paul lays this work upon them, and in his second letter, written several months later, he praises them for their forwardness in it, and assures them that he has been boasting of them to the Macedonian Christians (I. Cor. xvi. 1; II. Cor. ix). The philosophy of Christian union that the Apostle Paul sees in this is expressed with delicacy but not with uncertainty in the following verses: "For the administration of this service not only supplieth the want of the saints, but aboundeth also through many thanksgivings unto God; seeing that through the proving of you by this ministration they glorify God for the obedience of your confession unto the Gospel of Christ, and for the liberality of your contribution unto them and to all; while they themselves also, with supplication on your behalf, long after you by reason of the exceeding grace of God in you." Ah! There, instead of hair-splittings, and suspicions, and coldness, and alienations; instead of the bandying back and forth of ugly words, and prolonged discussions upon mooted points—there was "sweet charity," and the fruits of it, and the thanksgivings to God by reason of it, and Jews and Gentiles (wonderful! wonderful!) *longing after one another* because of the exceeding grace of God thus discovered. Thus practical love was made by the magic of the Gospel and management of Paul the solvent of the most uncon-

querable disagreements, and that hard old world in which hatred and warfare were the rule, with seldom an exception in favor of friendship and peace; in which there was not an asylum for the blind, or a hospital for the leper, or a home or a heart for an abandoned babe; in which clannishness was esteemed a virtue, and inter-ethnic charity was unknown, saw Jew and Gentile rise up together in the spirit of Christ's love to call each other blessed! O Logic, thou hast never wrought miracles like this! O Unity of Love, we still search for thee as for the Holy Grail! Biting and devouring one another, we search by logic in the spirit of legalism for unity. We invariably come back from our search torn and empty-handed, and the world does not say, "Behold how these brethren love one another."

INDEX

Agabus, 139.
Amos, quoted, 149.
Amphitheater, 185.
Ananias and Sapphira, 83.
Angel, of the Church, 280.
Antioch, in Syria, 123f.
Antiochus Epiphanes, death of, 153.
Apostles, Christological teaching of, 54.
Aquila, 234.
Aristarchus, 250.
Arnold, quoted, 189.
Athens, 227.
Atonement, 23, 46, 59, 60.
Augustine, quoted, 140.
Baptism, 45, 51, 52, 224.
Baptism, culmination of conversion, 117.
Barnabas, 129, 159.
Berea, church established, 227.
Blasphemy, final, 73.
Brace, Charles Loring, quoted, 137, 187.
Browning, Mrs., quoted, 233.
Brutus, suicide of, 223.
Campbell, A., quoted, 274.
Carey, William, 177, 224.
Carlyle, quoted, 43, 232.
Charles IX., of France, death of, 154.
Christian, the name, 134.
Christophany, of Stephen, 96.
Chronology, of Acts, 17.
Chrysostom, 39.
Church, a praying brotherhood, 63.
Church, benefactions of, 67.
Church, basis of membership in, 52.
Church, social soul of, 67. (27)
Cicero, quoted, 124.
Civilization, Greek, 188.
Claudius, edict of, 18.
Commission, Christ's, 30.
Communion Service, 58, 61.
Communism, 65, 66, 140.
Cook, Joseph, quoted, 218, 221.
Cornelius, conversion of, 105f, character of, 115.
Corinth, described, 233.
Cowper, quoted, 28.
Creasy, quoted, 189.
Creed, Apostles', 54, 80.
Crown, of thorns, 31.
Crucifixion, 36.
Deacons, 90, 280.
Demas, 251.
Denominations, 135.
De Pressense, quoted, 213.
Dorner, quoted, 43.
Ebionites, 214.
Edersheim, quoted, 107.
Edwards, Jonathan, 39.
Elders, 280.
Elders, appointed, 230.
Elymas, the sorcerer, 192.
Epaphras, 250.
Epicureans, 139, 228.
Eunuch, baptism of, 107.
Evidence, cumulative, 148.
Expediency, 284.
Famine, in Jerusalem, 136, 294.
Farrar, quoted, 183, 207, 209, 228.
Felix, 19.
Festus, 19.
Fisher, Prof. George P., quoted, 154.
Forgiveness, 24, 75, 78, 100. (See remission).
Fortune, goddess of, 139.
Gallio, 236.
Gamaliel, 84.
Gibbon, quoted, 247.
Godet, quoted, 184.
Gospel, universal, 109.
Government, Roman, 188.
Hackett, Dr. Horatio B., quoted, 16, 17.
Hatred, 111.
Herder, quoted, 43.

Herod Agrippa I., 144.
Herod Agrippa I., death of, 152.
Herod Antipas, 145.
Herod the Great, 145.
Heroism, of the martyrs, 84.
Holy Spirit, historic presence of, 12.
Holy Spirit, promise of, 31.
Holy Spirit, guidance of, 113, 117.
Holy Spirit, in the church, 259 f.
Impurity, of pagan worship, 211.
Inspiration, 93.
Isaiah, quoted, 118.
Jailer, converted, 225.
James, the brother of the Lord, 209.
James, the martyr apostle, 143 f.
Jerusalem, destruction of, 214.
Jerusalem, superseded by Antioch, 219.
Jesus, a reality, 24.
Jesus, messiahship of, 31.
Jesus, Lamb of God, 35.
Jesus, unique life of, 36.
Jesus, Lord and Christ, 44.
Jesus, fellowship of, 57.
Jesus, love of, 59.
Jesus, hated, 76.
Jesus, method of, 99.
Jesus, on the Cross, 100.
Jesus, prediction of, 150.
Jews, mockery of, 71.
John the Baptist, 34, 61.
John the Baptist, message of, 149.
Judson, Adoniram, 177.
Justin Martyr, 84.
Kurtz, quoted, 285, 289.
Law and Gospel, 92.
Latimer, 84, 88.
Lazarus, resurrection of, 76.
Liberty, false, 129.
Livingstone, David, 177.
Lord's day, 109.
Love, Christian, 30, 78.
Love, as a principle of unity, 293 f.
Loyalty, to Christ, 132.
Luther, quoted, 84, 197.
Luke, author of Acts, 15, 16.
Lydia, converted, 223.
Macaulay, quoted, 184.
Martyn, Henry, 177.
Milton, quoted, 42.
Miracles, 43, 75, 81.
Miraculous, the, 20.
Missions, defended, 126.
Mystery, of the Gospel, 118.
Neander, quoted, 50, 203.
Necessity, intellectual, 13.
Nero, 144.
Nero, death of, 154.
Nero, Paul before, 242.
Nero, burning of Rome, 248.
Orthodoxy, 79, 80.
Paganism, ancient, 181.
Patronus, Patrona, 285.
Parker, Joseph, quoted, 202.
Paul, characterized, 15.
appeal to Caesar, 19, 241; conversion of, 166; early date of Epistles, 21; as a martyr, 84; brought to Antioch, 133; sent out with Barnabas, 159; primacy of, 161; endowments of, 165; apostle of emancipation, 168; preaching in Pisidian Antioch, 194; in Iconium, 197; in Lystra, 198; crosses the Aegean, 221; in Athens, 229; connection with Roman officials, 243; imprisonment in Rome, 247; not penniless, 252; as organizer and unifier, 275 f.
Pentecost, 31.
Pentecost, sermon on, 33.
Pentecost, preparation for, 34.
Pentecost, birthday of the church, 105.
Persecution, 75, 79, 80, 99, 125.
Peter, the apostle, 40.
Peter, primacy of, 84, 160.
Peter, true Jew, 112, 114.
Peter, revelations to, 116.
Peter, defense of Gentile Christianity, 208.
Phariseeism, 76.
Phebe, Patrona, 285.
Poetry, 42.
Prayer, unspiritual, 31.
Prayer, in the first church, 63, 64, 82, 151.
Progress, 128.

Prophecy, Messianic, 30.
Pulpit, prostitution of, 38.
Pulpit, sacredness of, 39.
Pulpit, themes of, 40, 44.
Ramsay, Prof. W. M., quoted, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 206, 220, 246, 253.
Ramsay, theory stated, 244.
Reality the soul of religion, 24.
Remission of sins, 46.
Renan, quoted, 124, 145, 232.
Repentance, 46.
Resurrection of Jesus, 35, 36.
Resurrection of Jesus, effect upon the Jews, 71.
Retaliation, 75.
Romans, hated by the Jews, 112.
Rome, 247.
Ruskin, quoted, 61.
Sabbath, Jewish, 109.
Sabattier, quoted, 85, 104, 158, 218, 240, 283.
Sadduceeism, 77.
Samaritans, conversion of, 108.
Sanhedrin, described, 83.
Sanhedrin, maxim of, 89.
Schaff, quoted, 43, 122.
Sectarianism, 136.
Sergius Paulus, 192.
Silas, 212, 220, 291.
Slaves, in the Roman Empire, 185.
Smith, Henry B., quoted, 43.
Sorcerers, 192, 193.
Stephen, Martyrdom of, 89 f.
Stoicism, 139, 229.
Strauss, 22.
Succession, apostolic, 54.
Synagogue model of the church, 281.
Tanners, unclean, 113.
Tennyson, quoted, 42.
Theology, systematic, 23.
Theophany, of Stephen, 96.
Thessalonica, church established, 226.
Timothy, student of Paul, 250.
Titus, student of Paul, 250.
Torquemada, 130.
Traditionalism, 127.
Tubingen, theory, 13.
Union, Christian, 52.
Venus, worship of, 211.
Victor Hugo, quoted, 145.
Way, the, 22.
We-narratives, 16.
Whittier, quoted, 42.